DOCUMENT RESUME

CE

ED 356 414 CE 063 525

TITLE	Meeting the Challenges: Coordinating To Promote Self-Sufficiency. Volume 1. Handbook.
INSTITUTION	Maximus, Inc., McLean, VA.; National Alliance of Business, Inc., Washington, D.C.; Pelavin Associates, Inc., Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY	Administration for Children, Youth, and Families (DHHS), Washington, D.C.; Employment and Training Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C.; Office of Vocational and Adult Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	[91]
CONTRACT	233-90-0006
NOTE	139p.; For the JOBS program federal funding resources, volume 2, see CE 063 526. Pages 115-129 have filled print.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Basic Education; *Agency Cooperation; *Basic Skills; *Cooperative Programs; *Coordination; Economically Disadvantaged; Employment Potential; Federal Programs; Guidelines; Human Services; Job Placement; Job Skills; *Job Training; Program Implementation; Remedial Instruction; State Programs; Statewide Planning; *Welfare Recipients; Welfare Services
IDENTIFIERS	*Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Program

ABSTRACT

This handbook provides information on effective approaches, methods, processes, and techniques that state and local agencies have used at various stages in implementing their Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) programs. It is intended for all state and local agencies involved in planning and providing services to JOBS participants, especially staff at human services, labor, and education agencies. The first section describes types of benefits that can be gained from JOBS coordination. The next section summarizes challenges that coordination efforts may encounter and some of the approaches states and counties have taken. Key elements of state approaches to address specific challenges follow. The next six sections each focus on one of the six specific challenges: (1) overcoming philosophic and programmatic differences among programs; (2) establishing an effective state role in promoting local level coordination; (3) making the most of resources; (4) establishing an effective information exchange; (5) building quality assurance and accountability; and (6) providing appropriate and quality services. Each of these sections consists of a description of the challenge, a summary of state or local approaches, and detailed discussion of the approaches. Appendixes include forms, documents, and guidelines developed by state or local agencies. (YLB)

ED356414

HANDBOOK

MEETING THE CHALLENGES:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CE 063 525

Prepared Under Contract #233-90-0006 for the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' Administration for Children and Families, the U.S. Department of Labor, and the U.S. Department of Education by the National Alliance of Business, MAXIMUS, Inc., and Pelavin Associates, Inc.

Volume 1

HANDBOOK

MEETING THE CHALLENGES:

Coordinating to promote self-sufficiency

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES Administration for Children and Families

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR Employment and Training Administration

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION Office of Vocational and Adult Education

PREFACE

In response to the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training (JOBS) program legislation, states are undertaking initiatives to encourage coordination. The purpose of this handbook is to provide information on effective approaches, methods, processes and techniques that State and local level agencies have used at various stages in implementing their JOBS programs. By examining some of these programs, State and local agencies may find approaches that enhance their own efforts to improve services through coordination.

Some of the techniques described will be easily transferable to other agencies. Some approaches will be transferable only when changes are made to adapt to local circumstances. Some will not apply to your agency at all but may, instead, serve as a springboard for creating an appropriate approach that suits your coordination partnership.

Although this handbook will not offer step-by-step instructions for every coordination process described, a list of State contacts is provided in the appendices to allow readers to obtain more information on the individual processes. The appendices also contain such back-up materials as examples of interagency agreements and guidelines for interagency councils. There is also a companion publication (Volume II) which includes matrices listing the coordination requirements and other key aspects of major federal programs.

This handbook is intended for all State and local agencies involved in planning and providing services to JOBS participants, especially staff at human services, labor and education agencies. Staff at every level of responsibility in these organizations will find useful information to assist in coordination efforts.

METHODOLOGY

Federal staff identified the State and local agencies and programs highlighted in this handbook. Regional staff of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Administration for Children and Families (ACF) provided the national office with information on states and programs with effective coordination practices. Staff from the U.S. Department of Labor and Department of Education also nominated potential sites. The selection process was designed to insure that urban and rural areas and different regions of the country were included.

Nominated programs covered coordination efforts led by labor and education agencies as well as human services agencies. Researchers contacted the human services, labor, and education officials involved in each coordination practice. These officials were interviewed by telephone to elicit information on planning, policies, mechanisms, procedures, and the agencies and individuals involved.

After reviewing the information on each nominated program, the most relevant State and local examples were selected for inclusion in the handbook. State and local staff reviewed the handbook's program descriptions for accuracy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

WHY COORDINATE 5

CHALLENGES AT A GLANCE (Summary) 11

CHALLENGE 1: Overcoming Philosophic and Programmatic Differences Among Programs (Summary) 23

Iowa 25
New Hampshire 29
El Paso, Texas 35

CHALLENGE 2: Establishing an Effective State Role In Promoting Local Level Coordination (Summary) 41

Idaho 43
Kentucky 47
New Jersey 51

CHALLENGE 3: Making the Most of Your Resources (Summary) 55

Ohio 57
New Mexico 61
Denver, Colorado 65
Chattanooga, Tennessee 69
Vermont 73

CHALLENGE 4: Establishing an Effective Information Exchange (Summary) 77

Illinois 79
San Diego County, California 83

CHALLENGE 5: Building Quality Assurance and Accountability (Summary) 89

Massachusetts 91
Pennsylvania 95

CHALLENGE 6: Providing Appropriate and Quality Services (Summary) 101

Kenosha County, Wisconsin 103
San Diego County, California 109
New York 113
Oklahoma 117

APPENDICES 121

Appendix A
New Hampshire: Interagency Referral Form

Appendix B
Idaho: Guidelines for Regional Advisory Councils

Appendix C
Kentucky: Responsibilities of the JOBS County Coordinator

Appendix D
Ohio: Interagency Agreements

Appendix E
Kenosha County, Wisconsin: Declaration of Commitment

Appendix F
State and Local Contact List

INTRODUCTION

This handbook is directed to you, as State and local managers of human services, labor and education agencies to help you provide services to welfare recipients through coordination. While the IV-A (welfare) agency has overall responsibility for both the design and operation of the JOBS program, the JOBS program requires the coordination of human services, education and labor agencies, as well as community-based organizations (CBOs) that provide services to the disadvantaged. The intent is to maximize services, avoid duplication and ensure welfare recipients are being provided the services they need. JOBS is part of a Federal effort to address long-term welfare dependency and to break the multi-generational welfare cycle.

The Family Support Act authorized the JOBS program and includes provisions to strengthen child support enforcement, recognizing that both programs offer essential services to help families achieve self-sufficiency. It is not, however, the only Act that provides services to welfare recipients; there are other statutes with objectives that relate to the JOBS' program objective of promoting self-sufficiency among welfare recipients.

- The Family Support Act created the JOBS program which offers basic and remedial education; job skills training; job readiness; job development and placement as well as child care and supportive services. JOBS also must include at least two of the following optional components -- job search; on-the-job-training; and community work experience and work supplementation.

- The Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) focuses on providing training and employment services to help economically disadvantaged youth and adults move into employment. Among these services are assessment, on-the-job training (OJT), classroom training, basic skills training, employment counseling, and job placement services.

- The Wagner-Peyser Act created the Employment Service to provide job placement to job seekers and employers and placement-related services including counseling and testing.

- The Adult Education Act supports educational services to adults age 16 and over, not currently enrolled in school, who lack the basic skills necessary to function effectively in their lives as workers, parents or citizens of their communities. Adult Education Act programs include Adult Basic Education (ABE), English as a Second Language (ESL), and Adult Secondary Education (ASE).

- The Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Act, as amended, focuses on establishing a closer linkage between attaining basic educational skills and entering occupational skills training. It also now includes increased targeting of the hard-to-serve or most-in-need.

(Matrices in Volume II give specific information on these Acts.)

In reviewing the services authorized under each Act, it is easy to see that the services often connect or overlap. Overlapping services and target populations led Congress to require coordination activities among human services, labor, and education services.

For example, JOBS requires coordination with JTPA and education programs available in the State. Specifically, at the State level, the JOBS plan must be reviewed by the State Job Training Coordinating Council (SJTCC) and, at the local level, welfare agencies must consult with the Private Industry Council (PIC) on the development of contracts.

JTPA requires the governor to issue coordination criteria to every Service Delivery Area (SDA) in the State. Before SDAs can receive JTPA resources, they must submit a Job Training Plan which contains a discussion of how each SDA will meet the governor's coordination criteria.

The Adult Education Act requires review of the State Plan for Adult Education by the SJTCC (as well as the State boards or agencies responsible for vocational and postsecondary education). Under provisions of the National Literacy Act of 1991, amending the AEA, two new coordination provisions were set forth: (1) State will require, as one criteria for allocation of AEA funds to local providers, that the providers demonstrate coordination with social service providers in the community; and (2) State will develop indicators of program quality for adult education and literacy programs and such indicators should be, to the extent appropriate, mutually supportive of indicators and standards developed under other Federal laws such as JTPA and JOBS.

While these Acts mandate coordination, it should be perceived as more than a statutory or regulatory mandate. Coordination is not only a useful tool for achieving a specific goal, but also a means by which all agencies can enhance and improve their individual performance. Coordination means helping each other help those in need. By working together, rather than in isolation, agencies can create partnerships that benefit all agencies involved, provide improved comprehensive services to clients and better promote self-sufficiency for JOBS participants.

Developing coordination partnerships among various agencies requires enormous effort and commitment. There are obstacles to overcome, and removing each obstacle is a separate challenge. This is why the focus of this handbook is on the major "challenges" to be faced in achieving effective coordination and possible solutions to these challenges. It includes information on techniques used by States and localities to achieve effective interagency coordination.

WHY COORDINATE?

Agencies involved in job training and education know that the disadvantaged population they serve faces a variety of problems in becoming economically self-sufficient. While each agency has something to offer, their clients' needs often go beyond the expertise and resources of any single agency. These agencies all have the same goal: to help its clients achieve self-sufficiency. Coordination can help them reach that goal by providing benefits to clients and agencies alike.

This section describes five types of benefits that can be gained from JOBS coordination:

1. Facilitates more comprehensive service for participants;

2. Enables agencies to provide higher quality services;

3. Encourages the efficient use of resources;

4. Helps agencies meet their goals; and

5. Leads to increased job placements.

1. Coordination facilitates more comprehensive service for participants.

Participants in various programs represent a broad spectrum of needs and levels of dependency. In many instances, individual participants have multiple needs. Different agencies have experience, expertise and strengths in different areas that address these needs. For example:

- Human services agencies have experience in providing case management and employment-oriented services such as job search, work experience and work supplementation, and supportive services, as well as being familiar with the scope of recipients' needs.

- Child Support Enforcement agencies can help collect child support from absent parents, thus increasing a client's monthly income.

- JTPA agencies have experience in providing employment-oriented training to meet the needs of both employers and disadvantaged participants, as well as such other components as assessment, basic skills training, job placements and supportive services.

- Education agencies have experience with basic skills instruction in English, English as a second language instruction (ESL), and preparation for the GED.

- Employment Service agencies have experience in assisting employers to find workers and workers to find jobs, as well as providing vocational counseling and testing.

- CBOs like the Community Action Agencies, the National Urban League, Opportunities Industrialization Centers (OIC's) and Goodwill Industries have experience in providing such services as job training and placement, special counseling and world-of-work skills training to clients.

Most often, a participant will need services provided by two or more of these agencies. The idea behind coordination is to take advantage of the multiple strengths in the community which are available within agencies to meet the wide-ranging, multiple needs of participants. For example, an AFDC recipient with multiple needs might receive the following as he or she moves toward self-sufficiency:

- Case management, child care, child support services and medical benefits from human services

- Employability and occupational counseling and on-the-job training from JTPA

- Basic education instruction from Adult Basic Education

- Occupational skills training from Vocational Education

- Workplace survival skills from the Urban League

- Job placement from Employment Service

- Post-secondary education from a college

A coordinated approach to service delivery can help decrease gaps in service provision, expand the extent of available services, and remove access barriers. Administrators can share information on their programs, promote the flow of clients through the systems, and, most important, promote self-sufficiency through coordination.

2. Coordination enables agencies to provide higher quality services.

Coordination can lead to higher quality services by allowing for a division of labor and specialization. If every agency had to provide every service, resources could be stretched too thin and the quality of any given service could suffer. With coordination, agencies can arrange for specialized services from the agencies that can best provide them. Higher quality services can also result from coordination because of a "two heads are better than one" approach. An assembly of service providers from different agencies--whether they are all human services agencies, education agencies, labor agencies or a mix--provides an environment for cross-fertilization and synthesis of ideas.

Timeliness is also a component of high quality. Coordination speeds up the delivery of services and facilitates the provision of appropriate services to JOBS participants in the desired sequence. Appropriate services may require special tailoring to make them meet the particular needs of JOBS participants.

3. Coordination encourages the efficient use of resources.

Because of budget limitations, no agency has as many resources for providing services to the disadvantaged as it would like. Coordination can help make the most of agencies' limited resources by:

- Reducing or eliminating the duplication of procedures (such as intake or assessment) through the creation of joint procedures or procedures accepted by more than one agency.

- Avoiding duplication of services by brokering arrangements. When agencies do not need to provide all services, they can specialize in providing the services in which they have expertise. They can also refrain from investing in new services, thus creating an economically efficient division of labor.

- Instituting referral procedures to save time, thus reducing the need for extensive and exhaustive negotiations on a per-client basis.

- Stretching resources to provide more services to more clients. Through joint or coordinated budgeting, agencies can examine the constraints and opportunities of various funding streams (e.g., capped versus entitlement funds and types of services available from different sources at different rates of Federal financial participation) through joint or coordinated budgeting.

4. Coordination helps agencies meet their goals.

Each agency has a program-specific set of goals. Coordination makes it easier for all agencies to meet their goals. For example:

- JOBS program administrators face a participation rate goal. Services provided by other agencies to JOBS participants help meet this goal.

- JOBS programs are required to provide components such as job readiness, basic and remedial education, job skills training, job development, employment and placement services, to at least some of their participants. Other agencies help JOBS administrators establish these components by providing many of these services to JOBS participants.

- JTPA programs have performance standards relating to serving welfare recipients. By coordinating with JOBS, JTPA agencies can serve more of the JOBS target population or provide better training services because of the JOBS agencies' ability to provide needed support services for which JTPA has limited resources.

- Adult education and literacy programs are responsible for improving the basic skills of educationally disadvantaged adults. Coordination with JOBS and JTPA allows these education programs to expand their capacity for services and to ensure that these adults are served holistically, to meet their many needs.

By coordinating, agencies can share credit for providing services for the same individual. For example, a JOBS participant who is co-enrolled in JTPA, and who is receiving job skills training and job placement from a JTPA agency will be counted toward JOBS participation and mandatory component goals, as well as being counted as a JTPA participant. A well-developed coordination plan can be of mutual benefit by giving JOBS participants easier access to labor and education programs while also giving those programs easier access to JOBS participants.

5. Coordination leads to increased job placements.

Recipients' needs, which may go beyond education or a job skill, must be comprehensively addressed to make the participants competitive in the labor market. The high quality, comprehensive services that result from coordination help prepare JOBS participants to meet the needs of employers, thereby increasing their willingness to hire participants.

If agencies are to meet their goals, then businesses must hire participants. Often AFDC recipients do not have the skills employers require. Other times, recipients are able to meet employers' skill needs but do not know where or how to look for a job.

Employers can feel besieged by requests from the many agencies reaching out to the employer community to solicit jobs for their program participants. Unfortunately, the result can be a reluctance to provide job placements to any agency. Coordination can improve the relationship between business and public agencies by preventing multiple appeals to employers. By coordinating their job development activities with the private sector, agencies are less likely to deliver competing or confusing messages. Coordination can improve the image of publicly funded training programs and increase participant placement in private sector jobs.

In addition, agencies should coordinate to share the results of these job development activities. For example, if the JTPA agency or the local Employment Security Service has information about an employer's needs and openings but does not share them with the JOBS program, many suitable matches could be lost.

CHALLENGES AT A GLANCE

The actual process of coordinating services for JOBS participants among various agencies is not always easy. The purpose of the following sections is to present several challenges that your coordination efforts may encounter and some of the approaches states and counties have taken.

Key elements of state approaches to address specific challenges follow.

CHALLENGE 1: Overcoming Philosophic And Programmatic Differences Among Agencies

IOWA - Page 25

OVERCOMING PHILOSOPHIC DIFFERENCES

- A Work Group was formed to analyze and recommend policies on welfare reform.

OVERCOMING PROGRAMMATIC DIFFERENCES

- Multi-agency Task Forces were created to solve specific programmatic problems.
- Yearly joint training for front-line agency staffs were conducted on JOBS program issues.
- Joint budgeting was used to set priorities for services and make best use of resources.

NEW HAMPSHIRE - Page 29

OVERCOMING PHILOSOPHIC DIFFERENCES

- State-Level Employment and Training and Welfare Task Force established three-level structure for addressing differences and issues.

OVERCOMING PROGRAMMATIC DIFFERENCES

- Agencies created a common referral form.
- Division of Human Services (DHS), Department of Education (ED) and New Hampshire Job Training Council (JTC) signed agreements on coordination and program design for Adult Basic Education (ABE) programs for JOBS participants.
- JTPA 8% Education Coordination Grant funds were used to hire ABE Coordinator.
- The ABE Coordinator worked to insure success of statewide implementation.

EL PASO, TEXAS - Page 35

OVERCOMING PHILOSOPHIC DIFFERENCES

- Coordination efforts sprang from long-established working relationships initiated by the local Texas Department of Human Services (TDHS) representative.
- Informal working relationships began the process of overcoming differences before formal structure was implemented.

OVERCOMING PROGRAMMATIC DIFFERENCES

- The local interagency council conducted joint planning sessions on fiscal matters.
- The Upper Rio Grande PIC assigned a liaison to TDHS which in turn out-stationed a worker at the PIC to handle reverse referrals.
- El Paso Community College (EPCC) worked with ABE Cooperatives (Co-ops) and TDHS to create a special educational package for JOBS participants with grants from Texas Education Agency (TEA) and the Higher Education Coordinating Board.

CHALLENGE 2: Establishing An Effective State Role In Promoting Local-Level Coordination

IDAHO - Page 43

INITIAL STATE LEVEL APPROACH

- o A State Welfare Reform Task Force was created.
- o Advisory Committees were formed.
- o A Coordination Committee was established.

MECHANISMS TO PROMOTE LOCAL LEVEL COORDINATION

- o Regional Advisory Councils were formed to provide information to the state JOBS planning process and provide ongoing advice on JOBS.
- o Specific guidelines for responsibilities of the Regional Advisory Councils were established.

KENTUCKY - Page 47

INITIAL STATE LEVEL APPROACH

- o Interagency meetings were held to obtain input for the Commonwealth's JOBS plan.
- o Functional program-related Advisory Groups were formed.
- o Statewide issues for JOBS were studied and information was shared with local JOBS planning entities.
- o Criteria was developed to assure coordination among agencies.

MECHANISMS TO PROMOTE LOCAL LEVEL COORDINATION

- o Area Development Districts (ADD's) were contracted with to create local JOBS Interagency Councils.
- o County JOBS Coordinator positions were created to ensure that local issues are addressed.

NEW JERSEY - Page 51

INITIAL STATE LEVEL APPROACH

- o Top political priority was given to coordination.
- o Interagency agreements were negotiated to provide a framework within which local coordination could occur.

MECHANISMS TO PROMOTE LOCAL LEVEL COORDINATION

- o County committees and specified membership were mandated.
- o Agreement was required on county committees' plans by local parties before releasing funding.
- o JOBS Coordinator positions that reported to county committees were established.

CHALLENGE 3: Making The Most Of Your Resources

OHIO - Page 57

PRIORITY PROBLEM

- Sufficient funding was needed to match Federal funding.

OHIO'S SOLUTION

- Interagency agreements to secure additional State matching funds for Federal JOBS funds were signed.

NEW MEXICO - Page 61

PRIORITY PROBLEM

- Limited funds were available to provide sufficient training and supportive services for JOBS participants.

NEW MEXICO'S SOLUTION

- Interagency agreement was developed with the JTPA agency to co-enroll JOBS participants and to provide supportive services.

DENVER, COLORADO - Page 65

PRIORITY PROBLEM

- Drop-in child care was needed for JOBS participants during assessments, appointments and orientations with no funding from JOBS.

DENVER'S SOLUTION

- A partnership was formed with business, volunteer and community organizations to raise funds outside the JOBS program.

CHALLENGE 3: Making The Most Of Your Resources (cont'd)

CHATTANOOGA, TENNESSEE - Page 69

PRIORITY PROBLEM

- Full-time child care was needed for the children of JOBS participants.

CHATTANOOGA'S SOLUTION

- Head Start was used to develop a wrap-around program.

VERMONT - Page 73

PRIORITY PROBLEM

- Transportation was needed for JOBS participants in a rural State.

VERMONT'S SOLUTION

- The existing Medicaid transportation system was used.

CHALLENGE 4: Establishing An Effective Information Exchange

ILLINOIS - Page 79

ESTABLISH EFFECTIVE CENTRAL INFORMATION EXCHANGES

- Formal interagency agreements were enacted that promoted data exchanges between the Illinois Department of Public Aid (IDPA) and - the Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs, the state JTPA agency - each of the State's 26 SDAs - and the Illinois State Board of Education.

SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA - Page 83

ESTABLISH PARTICIPANT TRACKING INFORMATION EXCHANGES

- The Department of Social Services (DSS), adult education providers, and the PIC developed an educational MIS.
- DSS and community colleges (the assessment contractors) developed an MIS to report on participant assessments.

CHALLENGE 5: Building Quality Assurance And Accountability

MASSACHUSETTS - Page 91

STATE LEVEL OVERSIGHT FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY

- Interagency agreements between the Department of Public Welfare (DPW) and Department of Employment and Training (DET) specified services provided and expected results.
- DPW and DET developed a highly structured system for monitoring local performance.
- Regional Employment Boards (REB's) have oversight responsibility for local JOBS employment and training programs.

LOCAL LEVEL OVERSIGHT FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY

- Interagency "Quartet" Meetings identify and address operational issues.

PENNSYLVANIA - Page 95

STATE LEVEL OVERSIGHT FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY

- Joint Jobs Initiative Task Force manages overall program, approves local program design, and monitors local performance.

LOCAL LEVEL OVERSIGHT FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY

- Local Management Committees (LMC's) manage local programs and resolve quality problems that cannot be addressed at lower levels.
- Direct Service Teams identify problems in program quality and refer any problems outside their authority to the LMC.

CHALLENGE 6: Providing Appropriate And Quality Services

KENOSHA COUNTY, WISCONSIN - Page 103

PLANNING AND OPERATING A COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

- o Planning was done by local Department of Social Services (DSS) with political backing.
- o Interagency planning and training was used to overcome philosophic and turf issues and promote joint ownership.
- o Incremental implementation helped staff adjust to changes.
- o Interagency management reinforced all agencies sense of performance ownership.

IMPROVED ACCESSIBILITY OF SERVICES

- o Single service center has co-located eight agencies.
- o Joint intake, assessment and a unified delivery system are provided.

TAILORED SERVICES

- o Initial assessment is used to identify participants with special needs.

SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA - Page 109

PLANNING AND OPERATING A COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

- o The Department of Social Services (DSS), PIC and county educational institutions developed a single education consortium.
- o Educational agencies manage components jointly.

IMPROVED ACCESSIBILITY OF SERVICES

- o Community learning centers were established throughout the county.
- o Child care referral is co-located at GAIN offices.

TAILORED SERVICES

- o Educational program for JOBS participants was designed and expedited.

CHALLENGE 6: Providing Appropriate And Quality Services (cont'd)

NEW YORK - Page 113

PLANNING AND OPERATING A COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

- State interagency initiative led to the development of an integrated service system.
- Joint funding is provided by the state Department of Social Services (DSS), Education Department (ED) and Department of Labor.
- Planning and operation of centers are done at the local level.

IMPROVED ACCESSIBILITY OF SERVICES

- Service centers offer co-located or coordinated education and support services.

OKLAHOMA - Page 117

PLANNING AND OPERATING A LOCAL COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

- Family Enhancement Program planned and funded by Department of Human Services (DHS), Eastern PIC and Oklahoma State University (OSU)/Okmulgee.
- Job Corps 2 Program is planned and operated by DHS Job Corps and State Employment Office.

IMPROVED ACCESSIBILITY OF SERVICES

- Residential Family Enhancement Program provides seamless service.

TAILORED SERVICES

- Post-secondary education prepares participants for non-traditional, high-paying careers.
- Modified Job Corps program serves AFDC mothers.

CHALLENGE 1:

Overcoming Philosophic And Programmatic Differences Among Agencies

Human services, labor, and education agencies use different terms and work with different program cycles, primary target groups, objectives, expected outcomes, and reporting systems. These differences are reflected in their perceptions about each other and make it difficult for agencies to work together.

The administrators who are most effective in overcoming differences in agency philosophy and program objectives recognize that it is people, not laws or agencies, who coordinate. They begin by recognizing and accepting their differences. They seek ways to accommodate the best interests of all involved. As a result, they foster acceptance and respect for differences in other agencies. They create an atmosphere that promotes compromise for the sake of a greater, common goal -- providing services to the disadvantaged population.

SUMMARY

In the three examples discussed in this challenge, agencies found that ongoing communication was key to surmounting philosophic differences. The agencies developed forums in which all involved agencies had a voice in the decision-making process. The agencies' strong commitment to improving services to the disadvantaged was a prerequisite for forging the interagency ties that made coordination work.

Iowa's Welfare Reform Work Group, consisting of representatives from six agencies, conducts most of the work on coordinating the agencies' efforts and resources. In addition, task forces work on specific obstacles as they arise. Staffs participate in joint training sessions and budgeting is a collaborative effort.

New Hampshire's philosophic and programmatic differences are tackled at three government levels. Policy issues are resolved at the assistant commissioner level through regular interagency meetings. Operations managers meet monthly. I Teams, consisting of local office managers and direct service staff, discuss individual cases, training and other coordination issues. Among other accomplishments, coordination efforts resulted in the implementation of a successful JOBS/ABE model and the development of a common referral form.

El Paso, Texas JOBS Interagency Council evolved from long-term informal working relationships. The council conducts joint planning and solves the problems presented by different fiscal years by "lowballing" commitments and making commitments contingent on receiving expected funding. El Paso also uses reverse referral, which allows eligible people who enroll independently in education and training programs to be automatically placed in JOBS.

Working through philosophic differences allowed agencies in these examples to embark on specific problem-solving ventures. Some procedures and elements can be changed or adapted; some cannot. In each successful program, agency representatives tried to keep their focus on ***what could be done*** to benefit participants and the agencies at the same time.

IOWA

OVERCOMING PHILOSOPHIC DIFFERENCES

- o A Work Group was formed to analyze and recommend policies on welfare reform.

OVERCOMING PROGRAMMATIC DIFFERENCES

- o Multi-agency Task Forces were created to solve specific programmatic problems.
- o Yearly joint training for front-line agency staffs conducted on JOBS program issues.
- o Joint budgeting used to set priorities for service and make best use of resources.

Iowa's coordination effort began in 1987 when the Governor issued an Executive Order concerning six agencies:

- Department of Human Services (DHS)
- Department of Economic Development (DED)
- Department of Employment Services (DES)
- Education (ED)
- Human Rights
- Department of Management (DOM)

The Executive Order required the heads of these agencies to serve on a Welfare Reform Council and made them jointly responsible for the success of welfare reform. The Welfare Reform Council is headed by DHS, thereby ensuring that the IV-A agency retains the decision-making authority. A Welfare Reform Work Group was formed in tandem with the Council, consisting of the directors or bureau chiefs and other staff of the various agencies who could devote the requisite time to working out the details of welfare reform.

The Work Group is charged with developing recommendations for welfare reform and bringing them to the Council. Working together, the agencies that sit on the Council and Work Group designed and implemented the Promoting Self-sufficiency through Employment (PROMISE) program, which later became Iowa's JOBS program. This structure promotes a feeling of program ownership and fosters shared decision making. Both the Council and the Work Group continue to meet.

WELFARE REFORM WORK GROUP

Although the Council retains decision-making authority, the day-to-day activities of welfare reform take place in the Work Group. The Work Group began by defining the mission, roles and goals of the Group and the Council and by developing a work plan. At the outset, there was a philosophical split within the Group between those in favor of short-term services and those who preferred long-term strategies.

As part of the process for resolving this conflict, the Work Group examined the public perceptions and stereotyped views of each agency: "JTPA takes the cream off the top"; "DES doesn't serve"; "ED doesn't care about employment." Group members later agreed that it would have been counterproductive to ignore these perceptions since they continually surfaced during discussions on welfare recipients' needs.

In talking about the variety of these needs, group members finally agreed that some recipients are capable of finding employment quickly, while others require more intensive services before they are ready for employment. The philosophic split was bridged when the two sides agreed that both short-term and long-term services were needed. The concept of client empowerment--agencies are there to assist clients who choose the activities in which they will participate--helped the agencies to overcome philosophical differences.

The Work Group adopted some strategies for resolving conflicts. These strategies included eliciting comments from all the members and polling members to find out how they viewed the issues being discussed. As a result, the Work Group members felt that everyone had ample opportunity to contribute each agency's perspective, making the members more willing to listen to each other. When a course of action under discussion appeared to threaten a member's agency, the group would re-examine all available options to defuse the negative view. Group members found it helpful to focus on two questions: "What is best for the participants?" and "How can we try to serve the greatest number of participants with the best possible service?"

TASK FORCES

Open discussion, a strong commitment, and focusing on participants and problems to be solved helped Iowa's Work Group members overcome their philosophic differences. This approach produced highly positive results and laid the groundwork for such additional coordination efforts as forming interagency, task-specific groups (Task Forces) to work out solutions to specific programmatic problems.

For instance, the Work Group designed the initial forms for the PROMISE JOBS program, but a lack of planning time precluded perfecting them. When problems arose with the forms, field staff put together a Forms Task Force and initiated a form reduction and simplification effort to reduce paperwork.

Among others, the Task Force worked on the Client Record File, forms to initiate payment for child care and transportation assistance, Rights and Responsibilities for Clients (used in orientations), referral forms and time and attendance forms. These forms are uniformly used Statewide. Similarly, when various agency staffs decided that the Employment Development Plan was too long, the Forms Task Force recommended a shorter version.

Task Forces are created as the need to focus on a specific problem arises and are dismantled when their assignments have been completed. Although temporary, Task Forces can provide a forum for an exchange of ideas among agencies. Furthermore, Task Force solutions in one area can lead to relationships between agency staffs that can help solve philosophic and programmatic problems in other areas.

JOINT TRAINING

At least once a year, front-line PROMISE JOBS staff from DHS, DES and DED attend a two-day, Statewide or regional training conference. Topics for these events are derived from surveys sent to the staff.

Topics have included Management Information Systems (MIS), Employment Development Plans (EDPs), classroom training, and the use of Pell Grants. Trainers from the participating agencies usually conduct the sessions; however, outside consultants have been invited to conduct motivational training.

Developing joint training to meet all agencies' needs has been an evolving process. At the first training conference, DHS staff attendance was limited because of budgetary restrictions. However, DES and DED field staff considered the interaction at the joint training sessions so valuable and DHS' presence so vital that they pushed for a way to overcome this difficulty. As a result, conference organizers scheduled subsequent conferences so that portions of the training most relevant to DHS were confined to one day, thus reducing expenses and allowing more income maintenance supervisors to attend.

Iowa has tried to hold single-agency training sessions but has found that attending agencies blame and complain about absent agencies. When all the agencies attend training sessions, the staffs focus on solving problems together.

JOINT BUDGETING

Conflicts among agencies can arise when program budgets are formulated independently. Iowa's approach to avoiding interagency conflict in the budgeting process is to use joint budgeting.

Joint budgeting is a three-phase process in Iowa. First, representatives of three agencies--DHS, DED, and DES--meet to work on a biennial budget. The representatives are drawn from the Work Group and the fiscal department in each agency. This budgeting group develops and proposes initiatives to the DHS Director of JOBS. These initiatives have included appropriating more State funds, plans to draw down more Federal dollars, and an integrated management information system to tie the three main agencies together in an automated network.

In the second phase, the director prepares the budget. Both the budget and the budgeting group's recommendations are reviewed by the Council on Human Services. (This Council is an internal DHS advisory group that must approve the budgets for all DHS programs.) In the last phase, the Council on Human Services prepares the final budget and submits it to the State's overall budgeting process for approval.

The budgeting group is open to input from other agencies. Members of the group make budget decisions jointly. They do so by continually focusing on setting priorities and basing allocations on those priorities. Because the Work Group devoted considerable time to overcoming differences during its formative stages, the "turfism" that might be expected to surface in this kind of situation does not occur. A common remark made by representatives of Iowa's agencies is, "We've been coordinating for so long now that it's just become second nature to us."

NEW HAMPSHIRE

OVERCOMING PHILOSOPHIC DIFFERENCES

- State level Employment and Training and Welfare Task Force established three-level structure for addressing differences and issues.

OVERCOMING PROGRAMMATIC DIFFERENCES

- Agencies created a common referral form.
- Division of Human Services (DHS), Department of Education (ED) and New Hampshire Job Training Council (JTC) signed agreements on coordination and program design for Adult Basic Education (ABE) programs for JOBS participants.
- JTPA 8% Education Coordination Grant funds were used to hire an ABE Coordinator.
- The ABE Coordinator worked to insure the success of Statewide implementation.

The JOBS program in New Hampshire is managed by the Office of Economic Services in DHS and coordinates with JTC, Department of Employment Security (DES), Vocational Rehabilitation, and ABE in ED.

THREE LEVELS OF COORDINATION

Like Iowa, New Hampshire began at the top in its effort to overcome philosophic differences. In 1985, the Governor established an Employment and Training and Welfare Task Force aimed at reducing welfare dependency. The Task Force established a three-level structure for coordinating agency efforts and resources and for addressing differences among agencies that interfered with establishing a successful welfare reform program. These differences began with the basic philosophic differences among agencies.

For example, the employment and training system was geared toward accepting only those clients who could become employable in a short period of time. The focus was on the most in need who could benefit from the services within a given time period. This orientation was a reflection of the system's performance standards and evaluation process.

The education system's focus in on providing education for anyone who wants or needs it. This system does not traditionally operate within a framework of goals, time limits or eligibilities.

When DHS began coordinating JOBS, it needed the other systems to accept everyone--regardless of the difficulties involved--and make its participants job ready.

These philosophic differences gave rise to conflicts when the agencies began determining the most effective approach to take for implementing the JOBS program. The conflicts were and are resolved through discussions within the three-level structure.

There is no formal reporting and communications mechanism between the different levels. Team members report back to their agencies and allow problems to move up through their respective hierarchies to the appropriate level for interagency discussion and resolution.

COMMON REFERRAL FORM

A problem emerged when the welfare reform implementation began. JOBS participants referred by DHS to other agencies were given low priority for services. Other agencies did not see themselves as part of an overall network that shared clients, so they tended to give "their own" clients priority. Clients referred from other agencies did not always receive prompt service. Upper-level managers in the agencies decided that the best way to solve this problem was to have a referral form that was instantly recognized throughout the entire system, immediately identifying all participants.

Representatives from four agencies (DHS, JTC, DES and Vocational Rehabilitation) met to design and develop the referral form. Each representative had the authority to approve the final form. The four agencies then held joint training sessions on how to use the form. Senior staff conducted the sessions and stressed the concept of sharing clients and the need to give prompt attention to referrals from other agencies. By institutionalizing the referral process, the form reminds the agencies of their shared responsibility for clients, thus reinforcing the sense that they are part of an overall service network.

Agencies use the form internally to refer all participants from one unit to another and externally to other agencies, e.g., DHS JOBS to Vocational Rehabilitation. The agencies are pleased with the way the form is working. It has been re-designed to add the Department of Education.
(See Appendix A for a copy of the referral form.)

JOBS ABE PROGRAM AND COORDINATOR

ABE in New Hampshire has traditionally been delivered through non-profit, multi-service agencies who run Adult Learning Centers (ALCs).

After receiving funds through a competitive bid process, the ALC's operated independently of ED, which managed the contracts. When the JOBS program was introduced, the deputy commissioners of three agencies--DHS, ED and JTC--signed three two-party agreements that brought the ALC's into a coordinated delivery system. The agreements laid out the design features of a JOBS/ABE model:

- No new programs would be put in place until existing programs were full.

- ABE under JOBS would be reserved for the neediest of clients. Those testing below grade 8 on the Test of Adult Basic Education would get priority.

- 8-12 clients per cycle would be required or no program could start.

- The ALC would provide participants with up to 3 six-week cycles of 15-20 hours each of ABE.

- Program goals would be GED preparation and the academic skills for workforce participation, with an outcome of a job or transfer to training within 90 days of completion.

- ED would administer the program with the ALC's. Cost reimbursement contracts and invoicing from individual programs would be in a familiar format for the ALC's. Only the State ED had to report to DHS.

- JTC would hire a program coordinator from its JTPA 8% Education Coordination Grant. This Coordinator would report to both JTC and ED on the administration of the ABE program.

Although these design features were agreed upon at the State level, they were not developed with input from local program operators, who had concerns about them. For example, the complexity of the referral system worried many of the ALC program directors. ALC's were dependent on referrals processed through DHS and JTC. They were not allowed to recruit and would have to cancel classes with fewer than eight enrollees. The ALC directors were also pessimistic about achieving program outcomes given the skill level of entering students and the length of time they had to work with these students.

ALC's were not the only ones concerned. DHS and JTC staffs were skeptical about the program design and hesitant about participating in it. DHS social workers feared that sending their neediest clients for only 18 weeks of ABE was setting them up for failure. Vocational Training Specialists at JTC were held accountable for client failure, so they wanted to enroll only those who appeared to have a good chance of succeeding.

Given the concerns of all three agencies' local staffs, it is easy to understand why no JOBS/ABE program was started in the first six months after the agreements were signed.

In the meantime, JTC had hired an ABE Coordinator as specified in the interagency agreements. The Coordinator took advantage of the existing inter-agency network (the "I Teams") mentioned earlier to resolve the problems blocking implementation of ABE programs. His strategy was to present the JOBS/ABE program model to each I Team in the State and get its reactions. He listened to the concerns and brought them up in separate weekly briefings with the JTC operations director and the ED director of ABE.
The Coordinator served as a liaison between the two directors in working to resolve problems. He also wrote to the I Team members restating their concerns and indicating that the problems had been referred to the directors of the State agencies involved. By acting outside the normal channels of communication, the I Teams could identify problems for the Coordinator, who could then take them to the higher levels without having to ascribe blame or responsibility to any particular part of the system. In this way, the Coordinator could serve as an independent conduit of information from the I Teams to the State level.

ABE PILOT PROGRAMS

Since the new JOBS/ABE model was to be phased in across the State by the ALC's' voluntary participation, the Coordinator decided to look for three sites whose members had positive attitudes, good local working relationships, and a willingness to take risks and work on the model. After meeting with every I Team in the State, he selected the three he deemed the most likely to succeed. He approached these three I Teams with the objective of convincing them to implement the JOBS/ABE model as specified in the interagency agreements as a pilot program.

The Coordinator had listened to the I Teams' concerns about the State model and knew there were likely to be problems with the model when it was implemented. As part of his approach, he invited the I Teams to design an ideal program that could be implemented when the State model encountered problems. "Forget your agency affiliation and design your ideal JOBS/ABE program," he said. "Build in all the features you think would make the participants successful."

To further persuade the I Teams to implement the State model, he told them they could incorporate any of their "ideal" features that did not change the fundamental program design or require approval from the State. Program length and entry criteria would have to remain the same.

In return for their implementing the State model, the Coordinator promised to be the I Teams' advocate on program design changes with the State level administrators. With the understanding that their ideal model would be a backup to the State's model, the three I Teams accepted the challenge.

The Coordinator related the I Team members' concerns and reservations about the State-designed JOBS/ABE model to the State directors at DHS, JTC and ED. He also brought to their attention national research reports on the characteristics of successful programs. He pointed out that New Hampshire's program did not contain the characteristics enumerated in the national report--an indication that the program design was unlikely to succeed. He obtained a commitment from the directors to redesign the program as indicated by results of the pilot programs. He secured a second commitment to "hold harmless" the ALC's, social workers and JTC counselors who made referrals if the pilot programs didn't achieve the desired goals by working within the program design. This meant that future funding would not be jeopardized by poor performance, nor would punitive corrective action plans be required of the participating agencies.

The ABE Coordinator's effectiveness in securing the agreement from all parties was enhanced by the fact that he did not report to any one agency. Since he was supervised by JTC and ED while managing a DHS program, all agencies saw the Coordinator as acting in the best interests of the program, rather than acting to further a single agency's agenda.

Aside from the Coordinator's exceptional effort, the most interesting feature of the pilot programs is the fact that all the "bugs" were worked out before the program was implemented throughout the State. The anticipated problems stemming from the program length and entry requirements did arise in the pilot programs. However, solving these problems was simplified because their solutions had been devised earlier when the "ideal program" was designed. Since the coordinator had already paved the way with the commitment from the directors to redesign the program, all that was required was implementing the program modifications. Having an opportunity to work out the bugs ensured that future programs would be successful.

There are currently 11 sites in operation, and everyone benefits. JTC benefits because graduates of the intensive ABE program tend to be successful in job training programs. ED benefits because it has the ability to expand its services to reach those in need. The DHS JOBS program benefits by having programs custom designed to meet legislative requirements and the JOBS participants needs. The participants benefit by having increased access to appropriate services.

EL PASO, TEXAS

OVERCOMING PHILOSOPHIC DIFFERENCES

- Coordination efforts sprang from long-established working relationships initiated by the local Texas Department of Human Services (TDHS) representative.

- Informal working relationships began the process of overcoming differences before a formal structure was implemented.

OVERCOMING PROGRAMMATIC DIFFERENCES

- The local interagency council conducted joint planning sessions on fiscal matters.

- The Upper Rio Grande PIC assigned a liaison to TDHS which in turn out-stationed a worker at the PIC to handle reverse referrals.

- El Paso Community College (EPCC) worked with ABE Cooperatives (Co-ops) and TDHS to create a special educational package for JOBS participants with grants from the Texas Education Agency (TEA) and the Higher Education Coordinating Board.

El Paso is a good example of initiating coordination efforts at the local level. The coordination efforts here have been so successful that State officials have studied them to determine how to duplicate them elsewhere in the State. Some of El Paso's success has been attributed to its geographic isolation from the rest of the State, which creates the perception in the minds of agency officials and program planners that coordination is necessary for survival.

HISTORY OF INFORMAL WORKING RELATIONSHIPS

El Paso's ability to coordinate efforts to successfully implement JOBS has its roots in the mid-1980's. Coordination efforts were stepped up with the implementation of Project Refocus, a program that predates JOBS. Project Refocus was a welfare-to-work project similar to JOBS in that it adopted strategies that would ensure longer-term self-sufficiency. Project Refocus became Texas' JOBS program when the State implemented JOBS.

With the advent of Project Refocus, TDHS began meeting with other agencies in the community to inform them about the employment program and to secure education and training services for AFDC recipients. These initial one-on-one meetings evolved into regular group meetings with all the major

agencies serving the disadvantaged. The core of the group consisted of the larger service providers; other agencies attended on an as-needed basis. This group included the Upper Rio Grande PIC, EPCC, the YWCA, and the Adult Education Co-ops at El Paso and Ysleta Independent School District. Top-level agency personnel attended, as did key staff people who would follow up on agreements reached during the meetings.

This informal group, casually referred to as the "Heavy Hitters Council," met regularly. Its task was to find out what resources each agency had, what populations they served, and how to coordinate services among the agencies. Everyone who attended was involved in decisions, and the group always tried to reach consensus. This group eventually became the local JOBS Interagency Council.

Through its history of cooperating, the agencies have recognized key elements that aid in overcoming philosophic differences:

- Respect each other.
- Recognize that there is enough turf to go around, but not enough resources. No one agency owns the clients.
- Trust colleagues' professional judgment.
- Accept criticism of your agency without becoming defensive.
- Do what's best for the clients.

FISCAL MATTERS

The JOBS Interagency Council conducts joint planning. Because agencies operate on different fiscal years, the Council uses the Federal fiscal year for the JOBS program. Each agency is asked to commit resources to the JOBS program for the period. Because this is difficult for Council agencies not operating on the Federal fiscal year, Council members have an understanding that this problem will be handled in one of two ways.

One way is to "lowball" commitments. Agencies using this method commit only services they know will be available to JOBS for the period. If additional resources become available during the fiscal year, the agencies can contribute them at that time.

The other way is to make commitments contingent on getting expected funding in an agency's following fiscal year. These contingencies can be made explicit in agreements, or they can be implicit. Members of the Council accept that there is a degree of uncertainty, and agencies are therefore not held to prior commitments when their funding falls through.

Council members have also demonstrated flexibility on fiscal matters outside Council meetings. For example, as the local Child Care Management Services (CCMS) agency, the YWCA bills for services after they are provided. The delay in payment creates serious cash flow difficulties. Two steps alleviated the problem. TDHS gave all 27 of the CCMSs in the State a one-time advance payment on services not yet provided, and the billing cycle has been increased from once to twice a month to permit quicker reimbursement.

REVERSE REFERRAL

Another interesting aspect of El Paso's coordination efforts is its use of reverse referrals. Most JOBS programs have referral arrangements between agencies. In El Paso, TDHS refers JOBS participants to service providers to receive education and training. However, AFDC recipients also enroll in education and training programs without being referred by JOBS staff. Any AFDC recipients who enter an education or training program on their own are referred back to TDHS (a reverse referral) for enrollment in the JOBS program. This allows them to qualify for the supportive services that TDHS provides under JOBS.

An out-stationed TDHS worker at the Upper Rio Grande PIC (for El Paso) assists the reverse referral process for those who enroll in JTPA programs on their own. The TDHS worker can intake AFDC recipients who walk into the PIC into the JOBS program and arrange for supportive services. The TDHS worker then performs case management functions for these walk-in clients. The out-stationed TDHS worker also serves as a resource for PIC staff who deal with JOBS participants referred by TDHS. Similarly, the PIC assigns a liaison to TDHS to serve as a resource for TDHS staff. The idea of an out-stationed TDHS worker came from the Heavy Hitters Council.

PROJECT FORWARD (ABE)

To meet the special needs of the JOBS program, EPCC applied for and received a grant from TEA to develop an educational package for JOBS participants that could be replicated throughout the State--Project FORWARD. The curriculum was designed to meet the particular educational needs of JOBS participants and require attendance for 20 hours a week to satisfy JOBS participation regulations.

In Texas, the ABE Co-ops are the administrative entity for adult education funds and can receive special TEA funds to serve JOBS participants. EPCC first approached the El Paso ABE Co-ops in the conceptual stage of Project FORWARD and suggested a collaborative effort in which EPCC would develop a curriculum and train ABE Co-op teachers. The Co-ops would then educate JOBS participants using their special TEA funds.

The Co-ops were a little taken aback at first, feeling that they were being told what to do with their TEA funds. However, TDHS stepped in to mediate, clarifying the advantages to Co-op participation in Project FORWARD. These included:

- EPCC's curriculum would enable the Co-ops to meet the 20-hour rule.

- JOBS participants would be in separate classes, thus alleviating accounting difficulties which could result if JOBS participants were integrated into existing ABE classes but had to be accounted for separately.

- TDHS offered to help requisition classroom space, which was in short supply.

Once the Co-ops' initial turf-related resistance was overcome, other philosophic differences had to be resolved. There was a disagreement about whether Project FORWARD should operate during the summer. EPCC believed that parents should spend time with their vacationing children rather than attend school themselves. However, EPCC came to accept TDHS' view that JOBS participants were preparing for work that didn't have extended vacation periods. In turn, TDHS delegated responsibility to EPCC for scheduling the appropriate number of hours and accepted EPCC's certification on attendance and satisfactory progress.

TDHS's philosophy is that it has the ultimate responsibility for meeting JOBS requirements. To this end, it will provide whatever assistance it can to help education agencies meet those requirements. In the case of Project FORWARD, the TDHS region used a portion of its Employment Grant Benefit funds to procure Facilitator Aides. These Aides assist with taking attendance, dispensing tokens, and other administrative functions.

Resolving the struggle to procure classroom space provides a final example of how Project FORWARD agencies worked together to coordinate their resources. Although ABE classroom space had been exhausted by its regular classes, the TEA money for the Co-ops to serve JOBS participants could not be used to purchase facilities. TDHS worked with the Co-ops to overcome this regulatory obstacle. They secured donated facilities for classes. In some cases, TDHS leased inexpensive space for Project FORWARD's use.

CHALLENGE 2:

Establishing An Effective State Role In Promoting Local Level Coordination

The dilemma for State officials is how to institute mechanisms that will ensure local level coordination while allowing sufficient flexibility for programs to adapt to local needs. The State can be a catalyst for local level initiatives. When a high degree of coordination is evident at the State level, it sends a clear message of expectations to local agencies. State officials need to create mechanisms that will encourage local level coordination. These mechanisms can include establishing incentives, policy guidelines, interagency agreements (financial and non-financial), technical assistance, coordinator positions and coordinating councils.

SUMMARY

This challenge describes how three states established an effective role in promoting local-level coordination. In all cases, the first step was to promote an example of State interagency coordination. They accomplished this goal through interagency councils, interagency planning, and negotiation of interagency agreements. Each State then instituted mechanisms to ensure local level coordination.

Idaho, being a rural, sparsely populated State, used existing regions rather than counties as the local planning entities and created a Regional Advisory Council for each one. The Regional Advisory Councils became an ongoing source of local feedback and ideas on JOBS operations.

Kentucky contracted with existing sub-state agencies to form county Interagency Councils and facilitate their planning process. Local level coordination occurred as the Interagency Councils followed State mandates to develop county JOBS plans and then advised and made recommendations on JOBS program operations. Along with Interagency Councils, the State established JOBS Coordinator positions in the county offices.

New Jersey mandated the creation of county REACH/JOBS Planning Committees and specified their membership. The State also required key local parties to agree to the committees' plans of action before it would release REACH/JOBS funding to a county. JOBS Coordinator positions which reported to the Committees were established.

The approaches of these three States were similar in some instances, but each was tailored to the specific circumstances and objectives of the particular State. The common thread running through them is that the State can promote and ensure coordination while still allowing local flexibility.

IDAHO

INITIAL State LEVEL APPROACH

- o State Welfare Reform Task Force was created.
- o Advisory Committees were formed.
- o Coordination Committee was established.

MECHANISMS TO PROMOTE LOCAL LEVEL COORDINATION

- o Regional Advisory Councils were formed to provide information to the State JOBS planning process and provide ongoing advice on JOBS.
- o Specific guidelines for responsibilities of the Regional Advisory Councils were established.

INITIAL STATE LEVEL APPROACH

The State Department of Health and Welfare (DHW) is responsible for administering the JOBS program in Idaho. The JOBS planning process began at the State level with the formation of a Welfare Reform Task Force consisting of division heads and agency directors from all involved agencies to coordinate the development of the JOBS plan.

As part of the planning effort, the State also established Advisory Committees (including one for JOBS) composed of representatives from education, labor, housing and human services agencies. A Coordination Committee, composed of DHW, and the State Departments of Employment (DOE) and Education (Division of Vocational Education) was also established.

Early in the process, the Welfare Reform Task Force decided that local level coordination would be most effective if planning were done at the local level. Because of the diverse needs in the State, local planning was needed to ensure effective JOBS coordination and administration at the local level.

REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCILS

DHW's seven regional offices, each encompassing more than one county, served as the basis for local coordination. Each DHW Regional Director was instructed to establish a Regional Advisory Council composed of representatives from DHW, DOE and the Division of Vocational Education, whose members were to build on their knowledge of local community services in developing and providing suggestions to the regional DHW office on local

service delivery and coordination. In this model, regions are considered the local JOBS entity.

To ensure overall consistency of structure, the Welfare Reform Task Force developed general guidelines for the Regional Directors to use in establishing the Regional Advisory Councils. The guidelines included directions on the basic composition of the groups and their duties and responsibilities. *(See Appendix B for a copy of the guidelines.)* The required core membership of the Regional Advisory Councils closely reflected the make-up of the Statewide JOBS Advisory Committee. However, regions were given flexibility in determining additional membership, such as representatives from Legal Aid, client advocacy groups, alternative school programs and community-based service organizations. The size and membership of the Regional Advisory Councils reflected regional needs and varied from region to region.

These Regional Advisory Councils are charged with:

- Reviewing the regional JOBS plan before its submission to DHW's Central Office;
- Identifying community resources and services to augment JOBS;
- Assessing client service providers and reviewing proposals for contracted services;
- Assessing JOBS implementation strategies and service delivery model outcomes of the regional plan; and
- Providing recommendations for JOBS plan amendments .

Although few obstacles were encountered in setting up the Regional Advisory Councils, there were obstacles in making them work. Among them were different perceptions of the Council's role and responsibilities and what it meant to be a part of the JOBS planning process. Some members thought the Council would have a free hand in designing the local JOBS plan and in choosing service providers. Others viewed membership as an opportunity to get an inside track on becoming a service provider. Problems were eliminated by not allowing discussion of specific models of service, therefore, no opportunity to "showcase" was given. The Councils were charged with designing a service delivery model rather than looking at what each brought to the program.

State guidelines that delineated the role of the Regional Advisory Councils were also helpful in resolving problems encountered in implementing them. In addition, DHW Regional Directors were given primary responsibility for ensuring that the local Councils understood and followed State operational guidelines.

COORDINATION COMMITTEE

After the initial State JOBS Plan was developed with input from the Regional Advisory Councils, the Welfare Reform Task Force was dismantled. However, the Coordination Committee, which was formed at the same time, continues to meet quarterly.

The purpose of the Committee is to deliberate on such issues as:

- information sharing
- plan modification and development
- program coordination
- JOBS policies

The Coordination Committee serves as the hub of the spokes formed by the Regional Advisory Councils. Problems and solutions encountered in one region can be passed on to others for possible application. One Regional Advisory Council, for example, developed an assessment model that was sent to the Coordination Committee and is being considered for Statewide adoption by DHW. Not only can regions look to the Committee for information sharing, but they can also receive assistance in resolving problems encountered in implementing their coordination plans. To strengthen the Committee's role and promote coordination between the State and local areas, the Committee visited each of the seven regions as a team. Its plan calls for continued semi-annual visits.

KENTUCKY

INITIAL STATE LEVEL APPROACH

- o Interagency meetings were held to obtain input for the Commonwealth's JOBS plan.
- o Functional program-related Advisory Groups were formed.
- o Statewide issues for JOBS were studied and information was shared with local JOBS planning entities.
- o Criteria was developed to assure coordination among agencies.

MECHANISMS TO PROMOTE LOCAL LEVEL COORDINATION

- o Area Development Districts (ADDs) were contracted with to create local JOBS Interagency Councils.
- o County JOBS Coordinator positions were created to ensure that local issues were addressed.

INITIAL STATE LEVEL APPROACH

In Kentucky, the Department of Social Insurance (DSI) is responsible for administering the JOBS program. Kentucky's initial steps were similar to Idaho's. DSI began the JOBS development process by holding a series of interagency meetings to review the applicable regulations and make recommendations on the Commonwealth's adoption of various options and a broad program design. To provide information for the development of a State JOBS plan, DSI also established five Advisory Groups:

- Employment and training
- Education
- Child care
- Transportation
- Teen pregnancy and parenting

Advisory Groups were composed of representatives of all levels of human services, education and labor agencies, public interest and advocacy groups, local service providers, SDA's, employers (usually CEOs) and others. Advisory Groups addressed the full range of issues related to JOBS, including coordination. Reports and recommendations from each group went to DSI and were important contributions to Kentucky's JOBS plan.

Kentucky also met with representatives of advocacy groups not represented in the Advisory Groups.

In addition to providing inspiration to local level planners, the State level JOBS planning process directly contributed to local planning efforts. Advisory Groups studied a number of issues that affected the overall JOBS implementation. The information gained from their studies was then given to county planning entities to help them make their local assessments. Thus the information supplied by State Advisory Groups allowed local planners to develop activities and priorities based on individual local needs and situations.

KENTUCKY JOB TRAINING COORDINATING COUNCIL

Kentucky also ensures coordination with special action plans for efforts between agencies. For example, DSI and the Department of Employment Service responded to a request from the Kentucky Job Training Coordinating Council to develop a "Plan for Action With Measurable Criteria for JOBS/JTPA Coordination." The plan outlines nine issue areas to be addressed to improve coordination between the two programs.

It describes measurable criteria and recommended activities for each of the issues. When completed, the plan will provide specific guidelines for coordination between JOBS and JTPA agencies at the State and local levels and between the levels themselves.

The nine issues selected for the plan are:

- goals, outcomes and performance standards
- labor market analysis
- local plans
- funding
- intake, assessment and referral
- equity rates and service levels
- services and service design
- monitoring
- reporting

ADDS AND COUNTY INTERAGENCY COUNCILS

While developing its State JOBS plan, DSI faced the problem of ensuring that the Commonwealth's plan would serve individual needs at the local level. DSI needed a way to get input from the counties to incorporate into the State JOBS plan. The Commonwealth also wanted a mechanism for planning and monitoring the JOBS program that would require a minimum of resource expenditure and start-up and set-up time.

To solve these problems, DSI contracted with the fifteen ADDs to create and facilitate the continued function of county Interagency Councils. ADDs are sub-State organizations whose primary purpose is to provide planning and technical assistance. Established in the 1960's, ADDs have a long, successful track record of pulling together local resources in the most productive way. They were formed to accomplish the major objectives of locally elected officials and civic leaders within a geographic area. Therefore, ADDs had experience in developing a variety of county level plans that reflected the needs and the uniqueness of their individual districts and made maximum use of available local resources.

The ongoing mission of the ADDs is to bring together local civic and government leaders to accomplish objectives that could not be achieved by acting separately. With their many resources and capabilities, their county/State validity and credibility, and their function as a regional negotiator of priorities, ADDs are a unique entity for facilitating coordination among local governments and the Commonwealth.

ADDs' experience in working with State government meant that they were well acquainted with the necessity of achieving a balance between State control and county flexibility. The Commonwealth provided ADDs with the overall philosophy, parameters and goals of the JOBS program, as well as clear guidelines on setting up county JOBS Interagency Councils, which were established to develop local JOBS plans and monitor their implementation. The Commonwealth specified the membership of the Councils, which were similar in composition to State Advisory Groups. ADDs were required to invite representatives of human services, labor and education agencies, public interest and advocacy groups, local service providers, SDA's, PICs and local government to sit on the county JOBS Interagency Councils.

The initial task of the Interagency Councils was to develop a county JOBS plan. Although these plans had to be within the parameters of policy set at the State level, there was still considerable flexibility. Interagency Councils sent their local JOBS plans to the State to be incorporated into the Commonwealth's JOBS plan. The Councils continue to meet to review and make recommendations on the JOBS program. ADDs convey advice from the Councils to State officials.

COUNTY JOBS COORDINATORS

In addition to contracting with ADDs and creating county JOBS Interagency Councils, the Commonwealth took another action that fostered county level coordination. It established a county JOBS Coordinator in the county DSI office. *(See Appendix C for position description)*

The JOBS Coordinator in each county office acts as the liaison between agencies and the community. Although the case manager has the lead role in providing participant services, the JOBS Coordinator is responsible for identifying and influencing coordination in program operations and has the lead at the local level to ensure that issues are identified and resolved. Generally, there is one Coordinator per county. However, larger counties may have more than one, and one Coordinator may sometimes serve more than one county.

The JOBS Coordinator is considered the center of the web of services and programs. As the local negotiator and monitor, JOBS Coordinators ensure that prospective participants are adequately informed about the program. They have daily contact with other agencies and community providers to make sure that common goals and interests are maintained.

NEW JERSEY

INITIAL STATE LEVEL APPROACH

- o Top political priority was given to coordination.
- o Interagency agreements were negotiated to provide a framework within which local coordination could occur.

MECHANISMS TO PROMOTE LOCAL LEVEL COORDINATION

- o County committees and specified membership were mandated .
- o Agreement was required on county committees' plans by local parties before releasing funding.
- o JOBS Coordinator positions that reported to county committees were established.

INITIAL STATE LEVEL APPROACH

In 1989, the New Jersey JOBS program was implemented under the Department of Human Services' (DHS) existing REACH (Realizing Economic ACHievement) program to create REACH/JOBS. Unlike Kentucky and Idaho, New Jersey's JOBS program is run by county agencies rather than county offices of State agencies. As one of the fifteen State-supervised, county administered systems, New Jersey's counties have a great deal of autonomy in executing the JOBS programs. Therefore, New Jersey's response to the challenge of coordination differs from Idaho's and Kentucky's.

New Jersey did, however, take the same first step as the other two States: it provided an example of coordination at the State level. The governor made the goal of meaningful welfare reform through the REACH program a top political priority. This status led to a consensus among State Commissioners of Human Services, Labor and Education about the need to coordinate and to commit department resources and staff to implementing REACH. Setting "coordination of programs" as a top political priority gave REACH the commitment from department officials that was necessary to overcome many of the obstacles that arose out of the natural reluctance and resistance of agency staff to work with people from outside the agency.

Following the commitment by State Commissioners to work together in developing REACH, written agreements were established between various State agencies and DHS. These agreements outlined the roles and responsibilities of each agency and DHS in developing and operating REACH.

Signing these agreements and issuing directives to agency staff to cooperate with other State agencies in developing coordinated REACH programs demonstrated what State Commissioners expected of operations at the local levels.

COUNTY PLANNING COMMITTEES

State level coordination, especially interagency agreements, provided the framework within which local level coordination would occur. The State then created a structure for local level coordination by mandating the establishment of county level REACH/ JOBS Planning Committees. DHS required the Committees to be co-chaired by the Directors of the county Board of Social Services and the PIC/SDA and specified the make-up of the remainder of the Committee.

Once constituted, the REACH/JOBS Planning Committees had primary responsibility for planning and operating coordinated services to REACH/JOBS clients, including deciding on the mix of services to be provided. Because of the high degree of delegation to the local level, the State instituted another safeguard to ensure that local level coordination would occur. All decisions made by REACH/JOBS Planning Committees had to be endorsed by the county Board of Social Services, the PIC, the county Board of Freeholders (legislators) and the county Human Services Advisory Board. The IV-A agency has overall responsibility for both the design and operation of the JOBS program.

To be certain that the ratification process was followed, the State would not release REACH/JOBS funds to the county until all four of the above groups had agreed to the Committee's plan of action. Making funding contingent on agreement on the coordination of services was a highly innovative mechanism. Thus, the State found a way to allow the counties flexibility in designing their REACH/JOBS programs while also guaranteeing that local level coordination took place.

COUNTY JOBS COORDINATORS

To promote further local level coordination, New Jersey established county REACH/JOBS Coordinator positions to coordinate activities related to the program. Unlike Kentucky, however, these Coordinators report to the county REACH/JOBS Planning Committees, not to DHS. This reporting relationship allows Coordinators to manage the connections and bottlenecks for all interagency relationships, not just those between DHS and other agencies. REACH/JOBS Coordinators meet with DHS State officials regularly to receive policy guidance.

CHALLENGE 3:

Making The Most Of Your Resources

One of the purposes of coordination is to use existing resources to expand services to JOBS participants. Existing resources may not be used as often or as well as they could be because they do not exactly match all the needs of AFDC recipients. However, when agencies put all their resources "on the table" with the objective of seeing how they might mesh together, they soon see numerous possibilities. The goals, needs and services of many organizations overlap. By collectively leveraging their funds and deciding which agencies will provide what services, agencies can fill in the gaps and stretch the providing power of their resources.

SUMMARY

This challenge describes how five states found productive and creative ways to leverage their resources.

Ohio went to other state agencies for matching non-Federal funds to match the Federal fund. The result is "pass through" agreements that allow the state to access resources previously unused for JOBS services.

New Mexico used an interagency agreement to extend the availability of supportive services for JOBS participants. Under this agreement, JTPA may provide some supportive services to JOBS participants enrolled in its activities. This allows JOBS to provide more services in other areas.

Denver, Colorado created a drop-in child care center for the children of JOBS participants at a case management service delivery unit by working through a community council to identify sources of funding and assistance. The center was created without using JOBS funds.

Chattanooga, Tennessee, has implemented a program that is also making the most of resources to solve the problem of child care for JOBS participants. The JOBS and Head Start programs have been coordinated to create a wrap-around program for children of JOBS participants. The program also provides several additional benefits for JOBS participants, all at no cost to JOBS.

Vermont, rather than spend time identifying resources and creating a new transportation system built on an existing system created for Medicaid recipients--the Vermont Public Transportation Association, under the auspices of the Department of Social Services. This system consists of local transportation providers within a district.

OHIO

PRIORITY PROBLEM

- Sufficient funding was needed to match the Federal funding.

OHIO'S SOLUTION

- Interagency agreements to secure additional State matching funds for Federal JOBS funds were signed.

Ohio has sought the most effective ways to use its limited JOBS funds to provide maximum services to JOBS participants while avoiding any duplication of services. To meet its service objectives for JOBS and draw on others' expertise, Ohio's Department of Human Services (ODHS) established formal working relationships with other State departments and the Ohio Board of Regents. This created an umbrella of possibilities and a framework for funding mechanisms. The agreements were signed on the State level, with subordinate agreements to be signed at the county level. It is at the county level that the implementation is carried out. The county offices of ODHS are the link with the service providers.

Although many States use interagency agreements to provide services to JOBS participants, Ohio takes an unusual approach in some of its agreements with other State agencies. The purpose of these agreements is to secure additional State matching funds for Federal JOBS funds in order to expand services to JOBS participants. The State level agreements are the mechanism to access non-Federal funds of other State agencies. Ohio refers to these agreements as "pass through" agreements because ODHS passes the Federal funds through to the provider agency. The provider agency expends non-Federal funds to render services, then ODHS reimburses (passes through) the Federal match to the provider agency.

Each of the agreements details the services to be provided and the funding match to be used:

DHS AND THE OHIO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (Education)

ODHS has created three agreements with Education to provide services to JOBS participants. The first two agreements are with Adult Vocational Education. One agreement is for services which include any of the vocational education programs offered through public school districts, joint vocational school districts, and the full-service vocational education centers. The other agreement is for assessments including testing to measure skills, interests, aptitudes and abilities for various jobs; evaluating potential for new skill

training; and assisting in career development. This proposed agreement will become effective during the State's 1993 fiscal year. The third agreement is for providing Adult Basic Education services for JOBS participants.

Under the terms of these agreements, Education provides the services with the non-Federal funds. ODHS then reimburses Education with the 60% Federal match funds.

ODHS AND THE OHIO DEPARTMENT OF ALCOHOL AND DRUG ADDICTION SERVICES (DADAS)

ODHS has a similar agreement with DADAS. This department provides Alcohol and Drug Addiction services to JOBS participants. The primary purpose of this agreement is to establish linkages to Medicaid and other local services for providing substance abuse treatment to participants. The agreement also includes providing training for County ODHS staff to help them recognize substance abuse in JOBS participants in order to make appropriate referrals.

This agreement uses the same procedure as the one with Education. DADAS provides the services with non-Federal funds, and ODHS reimburses the 50% Federal match funds for "supportive services." ODHS requires that program expenditures before reimbursement be non-Federal dollars.

ODHS AND THE OHIO BOARD OF REGENTS

Through this agreement, two-year colleges provide support and retention services to JOBS participants. These services include extensive orientation to college, like management skills, and organized studying and tutoring. The retention services are for one year only and are intended to mainstream JOBS students into the general student body. The Board provides services with the non-Federal match, then ODHS provides the Federal match.

In all of these agreements, ODHS agreed to encourage its local offices to access the services provided by the departments and the Board of Regents. The departments, in turn, agreed to provide technical assistance when needed. Each agreement clearly spells out the responsibilities of each party, the specific terms and methods of compensation, who will retain what records, confidentiality, reporting requirements, and how audit exceptions and disputes will be handled. Separate agreements were worked out at the county level for referrals and other operational details.

While all the agencies were exceptionally cooperative, the process of working out the agreements required a great deal of time. According to one source, "It was rather like trying to match right and left mittens when we were trying to

match up funding sources. Since the State legislature could not always give enough to match, we had to look at other State and local agencies." In this process, it was of vital importance to ensure that the Federal maintenance of effort was met, as well as the Federal match requirement. This meant deciding how to apply the various funding sources, what the exact calculations would be, and where to draw the line. It also meant making sure there was no duplicate matching of non-Federal funds.

There was also some concern over the issue of control. In these pass-through agreements, the County ODHS offices do not have the financial control they exercise in their usual interagency agreements since the funds now flow from the State. This concern was eased by having the county offices negotiate separate agreements with local providers that focus on the details of implementing the programs on a local level. The County ODHS offices maintain control through their responsibility for appropriate referrals to the services under the agreements.

There have been several benefits from Ohio's approach. One in particular is that more agencies are involved in providing services to JOBS participants. This expansion of providers comes from the principle of "economy of scale." Since the programs are run on a county level, many agencies did not think it was cost effective or effort effective to develop services to JOBS participants. With this high level of coordination, however, these agencies see that their programs have the potential to be implemented on a Statewide basis--a potential of 88 counties versus one or two counties. The approach opened up the entire State, so more agencies are motivated to participate.

Ohio's interagency agreements have allowed the State to make the maximum use of available funds, build on existing services where appropriate, and make effective use of other agencies' expertise in providing certain services. The end result is that JOBS participants now have access to a larger variety of services to meet their individual needs and goals.

NEW MEXICO

PRIORITY PROBLEM

- Limited funds were available to provide sufficient training and supportive services for JOBS participants.

NEW MEXICO'S SOLUTION

- Interagency agreements were developed with the JTPA agency to co-enroll JOBS participants and to provide supportive services.

Like Ohio, New Mexico is looking to maximize the use of JOBS funds and has explored alternative ways of providing needed services to its JOBS participants. Project Forward, the State's JOBS program that is administered by the Department of Human Services (DHS), has found one solution through a cooperative interagency agreement with the New Mexico Service Delivery Area (NMSDA). NMSDA is administered by the New Mexico Department of Labor (NMDOL), which provides JTPA services.

Although JTPA legislation discourages using JTPA funds for services that are available through another agency or program in the community, it does contain conditions under which JTPA funds can, in fact, be used for these services. Specifically, the Act States that JTPA funds can be used if these alternative services or facilities would be more effective or more likely to achieve the service delivery area's performance goals. It is these conditions that are the basis for the interagency agreement.

The JOBS program customarily provides such supportive services as child care and transportation for its participants. However, under the terms of the agreement the NMSDA provides training, and may also provide supportive services for single parent JOBS participants enrolled in JTPA classroom training, job search, On-The-Job-Training (OJT) or other activity.

INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT

The NMDOL and DHS decided it would be more effective for JTPA to provide some support services directly to specific JOBS participants enrolled in JTPA, thus allowing JOBS to apply limited resources to other types of supportive services. In other instances, JTPA and JOBS could contribute jointly to a needed supportive service provided that, together, they did not exceed a total projected need for any individual. Before finalizing the agreement, both agencies reviewed their current level of services to the participants. The agreement enabled the agencies to expand services to a larger number of people than either agency could have done on its own.

Through the agreement, the DHS refers participants who have been certified eligible for AFDC to the New Mexico SDA. These participants are deemed "job ready" at the appropriate JTPA Labor Service Center. To maintain consistency and uniformity, the two agencies use a common JTPA/Project Forward Referral and Interagency Information Exchange form and a Project Forward Eligibility Plan. Any supportive services that participants may need are identified in the Employability Plan Agreement. DHS also provides the Labor Service Center with a list of participants referred on a monthly basis to use for client tracking purposes. Both agencies share information on any job vacancies and/or placement that Project Forward and JTPA staff may discover and effect through their job development contacts.

The NMSDA accepts all participants referred by the DHS into its JTPA applicant pools and places them into the most appropriate activity on an "as available" basis. JTPA staff also conducts program orientation, in-depth assessment, testing and counseling to identify the participants' abilities, interests, limitations and needs that are necessary to meet the objectives defined in the mutually agreed upon Employability Plan. Additionally, JTPA staff trains Project Forward staff in job development and job seeking techniques.

There were, of course, difficulties to overcome in developing and implementing the interagency agreement. Members of both agencies were long accustomed to coordinating to make the most of their resources and provide maximum services to participants. The usual approach is for the agency with the most applicable funds available to be the primary source of assistance for a particular mutual service or participant. In this case, however, each agency was concerned about audit exceptions and compliance with both JTPA and Family Support Act regulations. The issues of duplication, maintenance of effort, and supplanting caused concern. If both Acts provided for such assistance, and the participant was eligible for services under both, then who should "come first" or provide the service exclusively?

The heads of the agencies decided to seek clarification from the U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Office of Employment and Training Programs in Washington, DC. Their question: Could JTPA funds be used for supportive services for JOBS participants enrolled in JTPA activities even though such services were authorized under the Family Support Act? Based on this clarification, the two agencies refined their agreement to authorize a sharing and mutual contribution of resources. This will be tracked and coordinated by staff in both agencies. In addition, it will not exceed a total need estimated for any participant and will be based on available support from all sources in the area, including the individual's personal contribution.

The initial hesitation and caution were replaced by a positive "let's get it done" approach that benefited everyone. NMSDA benefits from this arrangement by accepting referrals and providing services to JOBS participants who are considered under JTPA as at-risk. The DHS JOBS program benefits by being able to stretch its limited supportive services funds and make maximum use of JTPA training opportunities. Most importantly, JOBS participants benefit by having access to more services through a realistic and pragmatic interagency coordination.

DENVER, COLORADO

PRIORITY PROBLEM

- Drop-in child care was needed for JOBS participants during assessments, appointments and orientations with no funding from JOBS.

DENVER'S SOLUTION

- A partnership was formed with business, volunteer and community organizations to raise funds outside the JOBS program.

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

The Denver Family Opportunity (DFO) program was created as a result of the Mayor's Welfare Reform Initiative and established by the Denver Department of Social Services. It is a public/private partnership consisting of a community council and a case management service delivery unit. The council is composed of a cross section of community resources. All "people resources" agencies have very active representatives on the council. The composition of the council reflects the diversity of agencies, organizations and resources within the community. The council includes the Governor's Job Training Office, The Colorado Trust, Community College of Denver, United Way, Community Development (City and County of Denver), Colorado Department of Education, Piton Foundation, U.S. West, Denver Housing Authority, Sisters of Loretto, and the Neighborhood Trust Council.

DFO's mission is to provide "targeted, comprehensive services to the entire (AFDC) family." However, it was often difficult to provide those services as effectively as DFO wanted because participants usually had to bring their children to sessions and interviews at DFO offices. According to one staff member, "Our physical environment was not child-friendly. Clients would come in to take assessment tests with crying babies held on their laps." Since staff and participants needed to be able to have frank, uninterrupted discussions, on-site child care seemed to be the answer. A child care center would also assist program staff in extending their child development services.

Staff and program administrators for the Denver Family Opportunity (DFO) program were concerned with the child care issue. The approach they took to solving the problem is an example of coordination at its best: multiple agencies, various funding sources, community involvement and volunteers all working together to increase the services to DFO/JOBS participants.

PLANNING FOR A CHILD CARE CENTER

As DFO staff began the planning process for a child care center, they identified several intervention points when drop-in care is essential. These included:

- o Orientation for JOBS participants, which lasts about 2¼ hours
- o Participant/case manager appointments, which last about 1½ hours approximately once a week during the first month
- o Child development screening, which lasts 40 minutes

DFO staff created a Task Force of about 30 child care providers, advocates and staff to assist in the planning process. Once they had designed the ideal child care center concept, they tackled the problem of funding.

The Task Force knew that the center could not be self-sustaining during the first year. Therefore, they reached out to the community and other outside resources through the representatives on the community council. They went to Public Service Company of Colorado, a State utility company concerned about early childhood education, and secured a $20,000 first-year operating grant from the company. The Task Force then applied for and received a Community Services Block Grant for $9,000 to be used for physical improvement on the new facility. Much of the labor to renovate the space was provided by volunteers. The Junior League of Denver had members who cleaned and painted the abandoned stores at night and on weekends.

Partnerships that DFO had already formed in the community helped to solve the problems that arose. One key partner with DFO and the Denver Department of Social Services is the Mayor's Office. When staff encountered problems with zoning and building permits, a liaison in that office helped them work through the procedures with the various responsible agencies.

Another partner is the Denver Public Schools' Child Find. This partner provides a program that trains Junior League volunteers to administer the child development screening and conducts any further evaluation required as a result of the screening. The child development screening is designed to give JOBS parents information on how their children are progressing physically and emotionally against the "norm." Children from six months to five years old are given a battery of tests called Early Periodic Screening and Diagnostic Testing (EPSDT). The EPSDT was developed several years ago as a Title 19 program under Medicaid.

Over 924 children have been scheduled to use the center since its opening on April 5, 1991. The center has also supported 38 DFO orientations. The Mile High Child Care Association, which helped guide DFO through the planning process and now operates the center, is another partner.

DFO reached into the community again to establish coordinating relationships with other resource agencies to support the family services referral system. DFO has over 38 service coordination agreements with local providers, as well as referral relationships with over 100 agencies who are members of DFO's council. These service agencies are considered DFO "participating organizations."

Agreements exist with such organizations as Denver Alternative Youth Services, Head Start and Denver Public Schools. Currently in negotiation is a system through which DFO case managers can link with Denver Public School social workers to coordinate the needs of children and youth. DFO is also working with Head Start to develop wrap-around programs.

The active involvement of so many community agencies and private organizations has enabled DFO to raise substantial funds for its activities. Revenues raised for 1991 amounted to $4.8 million. Federal funds accounted for less than half that amount. The funding is ongoing.

DFO's approach to resolving its child care problem made use of numerous resources outside the JOBS program--volunteers, grants from business organizations, other Federal monies, and various existing service agencies. Incorporating all these resources allows DFO to offer comprehensive services to AFDC families without using limited title IV-A funds.

CHATTANOOGA, TENNESSEE

PRIORITY PROBLEM

- Full-time child care was needed for the children of JOBS participants.

CHATTANOOGA'S SOLUTION

- Head Start was used to develop a wrap-around program.

COLLABORATION WITH HEAD START

The Head Start wrap-around program in Chattanooga is an excellent example of a combination of tangible and intangible resources coming together for the benefit of JOBS participants.

As the local Family Support Coordinating Council began its coordination efforts, child care was one of the issues that arose. Finding quality, affordable child care for JOBS participants usually presents a challenge for program staff and administration. The Head Start director is a member of the council. During the discussions on this issue, she saw an opportunity to extend the benefits of Head Start programs to the children of JOBS participants. Although Head Start programs are not intended for child care, they are highly desirable because they provide a rich child development experience. However, since Head Start is only a part-time program and JOBS participants usually require full-time child care, these programs were not an option for JOBS participants' children.

After discussions with administrators in the Department of Human Services (DHS) and JOBSWORK (Tennessee's JOBS program), the Head Start director worked with their representatives to develop a wrap-around program for JOBS participants' children.

The children are enrolled in Head Start from 9:00 a.m. to 1:30 p.m. for 170 days a year. (The Head Start program is not available during the summer months.) JOBS and Transitional Child Care Program funds are used to provide child care before the Head Start program begins in the morning and from its end to 5:30 in the afternoon. This service is available 250 days a year. The program is adapted in the summer to compensate for the lack of Head Start programs.

Children of JOBS participants have 18 slots at the Avondale Head Start Center. Twelve of the slots are funded by Transitional Child Care (TCC) and six by JOBS.

TCC provides child care to former AFDC recipients who are employed, who can be assisted for a period of one year after they first exceed AFDC income guidelines. The collaboration between Head Start and the JOBS and Transitional Child Care Programs has been an excellent support system for Head Start parents who are enrolled in the JOBS program. This extended Head Start day has allowed parents to keep their children enrolled in Head Start instead of having to place them in another child care program because of the need for full-day care.

As with any new approach to providing a service, there were problems to be faced and overcome. The Head Start director reports that one of the most difficult aspects of developing the wrap-around program was the difficulty of working with two completely different sets of regulations and the inherent red tape. The center provides participants' children with the same services available in Head Start, but used JOBS funds to hire another driver and the additional classroom staff and provide for the necessary supplies, sleeping cots, etc.

Another problem was coordinating the approval process to enroll participants' children in the program. JOBS case managers have to coordinate with JTPA to obtain approval before a request goes to a broker in the City of Chattanooga Human Services Department. The brokers then place the children in the program of choice. The process was slow moving and awkward at first. In fact, it took three months to place the first children in the program. Trial and error finally began smoothing out the process. The Head Start director's prior working relationships with representatives from DHS also helped work through the red tape. Together, they continue to refine the program.

The wrap-around program provides more than assistance with the child care and development issue. Eligible parents of children in Head Start are referred to the JOBS program. Many of these parents were previously reluctant to enroll in JOBS because they would have had to remove their children from Head Start. The Head Start program offers on-site GED and other literacy classes to the parents of children at the center. The parent education classes on health, child abuse and neglect prevention, child growth and development, parenting skills, etc., count toward the training requirements.

In addition, Head Start parents who volunteer as classroom assistants, bus aides and dietary/food service workers receive on-the-job training which also counts toward the training requirements. This job training experience and parent education in Head Start helps qualify them for full-time jobs in Head Start.

Employment at Head Start is the next step for many participants because the center continues the collaborative effort by frequently hiring former AFDC recipients as staff; 47% of the Head Start staff comes from current or former Head Start parents, many of whom were AFDC recipients. Those who have been good volunteers are hired initially as substitutes or part-time staff. When full-time openings arise, they are given priority for these positions, provided they meet the qualifications for the positions and can pass the formal training.

After satisfactorily completing the six-month probationary period, they are enrolled in the Child Development Training program or other competency-based training program and started up the career ladder. Head Start pays for tuition and books for continued college education.

To promote success, DHS has assigned a worker part time to the center to ensure continued case management and to coordinate assessment and placement. The DHS worker helps participants develop an Employability Development Plan that will assist them in meeting their education and employment goals, ultimately leading to self-sufficiency.

Because this initial program has been so successful, the Head Start/child care wrap-around program is being expanded. The Head Start/JOBS collaboration is also expanding to provide additional educational and job training activities to help Head Start and center parents reach their goal of self-sufficiency.

Head Start wrap-around programs offer numerous benefits. The children receive the benefits of a proven quality program by being in Head Start. They also receive health care and transportation on a full-time basis. Head Start has the potential to reach more children, and JOBS has full-time care for children at lower costs. JOBS participants also gain access to another resource--the parenting and education classes--with no additional funding from JOBS.

VERMONT

PRIORITY PROBLEM

- o Transportation was needed for JOBS participants in a rural State.

VERMONT'S SOLUTION

- o Existing Medicaid transportation system was used.

Vermont is a rural State with only limited bus service. When the Department of Social Welfare (DSW) instituted the REACH UP (JOBS) program to serve AFDC recipients, State program administrators knew transportation would be a major obstacle. Fortunately, the solution was already under DSW's control. DSW had established a Statewide entity, the Vermont Public Transportation Association, which provides Medicaid recipients with transportation to and from medical appointments, hospitals and pharmacies through a system of local providers in districts.

Each district has a broker who is responsible for obtaining the least expensive transportation for eligible Medicaid recipients in that district. Options include:

- Private individuals paid by the mile
- Vans from child care centers
- Community action agency vehicles used for meal delivery to senior citizens
- Taxi service
- Bus service, where available

BUILD ON EXISTING SYSTEM

REACH UP administrators decided to build on the existing Medicaid system rather than create a new system to transport JOBS participants. Program administrators recognized the value of tying into an existing system in which the staff was already familiar with available resources and their costs.

The process of linking a JOBS participant to available transportation begins when the REACH UP social worker identifies a participant's need for transportation and completes the authorization form, which is then sent to the Transportation Association's district broker. To streamline the process, the social worker gives the broker a maximum allowable transportation cost on the

authorization form for each participant. It is the broker's task to find the most economical means for transporting the participant. The broker negotiates with providers to obtain the lowest possible cost for each trip within the authorized cost limitations.

The Transportation Association charges REACH UP a loading fee for each trip to cover the costs of arranging transportation. The Association sends REACH UP a monthly invoice covering the loading costs and actual transportation costs for each participant.

The Transportation Association provides transportation to people who would otherwise be unable to participate in the REACH UP program. DSW administrators consider the initial transportation costs a worthwhile investment in getting participants started in the JOBS program. It has been the REACH UP staff's experience that once a person is actively enrolled in JOBS and making progress, other options develop to solve the transportation problem.

As a result of the joint program, transportation is no longer a barrier to participation in the JOBS program, even in the most rural areas in the State.

CHALLENGE 4:

Establishing An Effective Information Exchange

Establishing an effective exchange is not an easy task, but it is an essential aspect of coordinating programs. It will be difficult to maintain coordination partnerships if the involved agencies cannot obtain information from each other for program management, fiscal accounting and reporting requirements. Unfortunately, each agency may have different record-keeping practices and reporting requirements. Since the agencies share participants, they will need to share information as well. An effective information exchange will help agencies share otherwise "overlapping" or inaccessible information.

SUMMARY

The examples described in this challenge demonstrate different approaches to establishing information exchange systems.

Illinois' data exchanges are centralized. Agencies used interagency agreements as a vehicle through which to exchange information to meet their requirements for processing applications, tracking clients, evaluating performance and financial reporting.

San Diego's GAIN (JOBS) systems are local and focus on tracking individuals. Agencies worked together to develop educational and assessment management information systems to enable contractors to report on participants and assessors.

There is no set definition for an information exchange. The method of exchange among agencies can be central or local, automated or manual, or a combination of these methods. An information exchange has several purposes:

- Tracking participants
- Getting budget information
- Recruiting participants
- Evaluating programs (i.e., measuring participant performance)
- Improving services to participants

Just as there is no single model for an exchange, there is no set system for creating one. The members of each coordination partnership need to decide the specific reasons for exchanging data, what data they need, and the best way to exchange it. In developing systems, agencies must also protect the privacy of individual participants and maintain the integrity of their records.

By defining the information they needed from a data exchange, Illinois and San Diego were able to develop systems specifically designed to provide this information. They also were able to meet their various information needs without compromising the interests of agencies or program participants.

ILLINOIS

ESTABLISH EFFECTIVE CENTRAL INFORMATION EXCHANGES

- Formal interagency agreements were enacted that promoted data exchange between the Illinois Department of Public Aid (IDPA) and the Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs, the State JTPA agency; each of the State's 26 SDA's; and the Illinois State Board of Education.

IDPA is responsible for administering Project Chance, the State JOBS program. IDPA directly provides some of the Project Chance employment and training services. The other agencies listed above also provide services to Project Chance participants.

With so many agencies serving Project Chance participants, all agency representatives agreed there was a need to exchange information on common clients.

IDPA-JTPA INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT

It took two years to formulate an interagency agreement establishing a data exchange process between IDPA and the State JTPA agency. Both agencies pursued the development of an agreement because they realized the potential value of the exchange.

IDPA uses the data it receives from JTPA to:

- Verify Project Chance referrals to JTPA;
- Obtain completion dates of planned JTPA activities;
- Recruit IDPA clients participating in JTPA activities but not enrolled in Project Chance;
- Avoid scheduling common clients for competing activities;
- Gain client employment information to ensure that earned income is appropriately considered in grant calculations; and
- Locate absent parents and determine if they have employment income available for child support.

JTPA uses IDPA data to:

- Verify JTPA applicants' eligibility;

- Measure and adjust welfare performance standards by identifying the most difficult-to-serve clients; and

- Develop measures of welfare dependency reductions using case closings and grant reductions data.

IDPA data processing, research bureau and Project Chance staff along with JTPA data processing and performance standard assessment unit staff held a series of meetings to establish the data exchange process. Their initial step was to learn about each other's computer systems. As their knowledge grew about each other's data definitions, the agency staffs worked out the data they wished to exchange.

They also had to work through concerns about the use of exchanged information before they could reach an agreement on a data exchange. For example, JTPA voiced concerns that IDPA might use employment data to terminate AFDC benefits. The State JTPA agency consulted with the SDA association and worked with IDPA to include language in the interagency agreement assuring that no IDPA benefits would be discontinued solely on the basis of information obtained through the agreement. As an additional safeguard, the JTPA system added to its application form an acknowledgement that client information would be entered into a computerized system and shared with other agencies for the purpose of administering their programs.

The interagency agreement also addressed confidentiality issues. Both agencies agreed to treat exchanged information as confidential. The agreement permits each agency to make security inspections to ensure that this aspect of the agreement is enforced.

The monthly data exchange begins when the State JTPA agency creates a file of client information specified in the interagency agreement. IDPA then matches that file to create a common client's file that augments JTPA's tape with agreed-upon IDPA client information. No tapes are physically transmitted--files are electronically matched at the Department of Central Management Services, the State's data center that houses both agencies' files. Both agencies receive hard-copy reports that are distributed to local Project Chance offices and the SDA's.

SDA AGREEMENTS

Although all SDAs' information is centralized at the State JTPA office, that agency was unwilling to release the information without the consent of individual SDA's. Therefore, the interagency agreement with IDPA specified that each SDA could authorize an information exchange via an agreement with the State JTPA agency. All 26 SDA's have entered into such agreements and receive all the information IDPA exchanges with JTPA. This information includes on-line inquiry access to IDPA's client benefit information file. The inquiry system is used to confirm the type of assistance an applicant is receiving to determine and document eligibility for JTPA programs. As a security precaution, only specific terminals at the SDA's can be used to access IDPA's file.

The 26 SDA's have also entered into coordination agreements with IDPA. These agreements contain provisions for manual information exchanges between the local IDPA offices and the SDA's in order to track common clients. As a result of these coordination agreements, IDPA is able to get the following information from each SDA:

- Referral forms for all clients who attend workshops;
- Enrollment summary forms;
- Time sheets at the end of each four-week period, including a delineation of client reading and math levels and service referrals;
- Training completion forms;
- Synopsis follow-up forms that report clients' status at 60 and 120 days after class completion;
- Educational training/vocational training placement forms; and
- Employment placement forms.

IDPA-EDUCATION INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT

Included in the Education budget are funds earmarked for providing adult education services to IDPA clients. An interagency agreement between Education and IDPA makes these State funds available to IDPA to be used to draw down Federal JOBS funds. The agreement follows the JOBS Action Transmittal (JOBS-FSA-AT-90-16) on funds provided by a State agency other than the IV-A agency that may be considered a State's share. This agreement

follows IDPA and Education's 25-year history of cooperation.

IDPA uses Education data to calculate the amount of State adult education expenditures on Project Chance participants. This amount can be used as a State match to draw down Federal JOBS funds. Based on reports from local providers, Education compiles data on a quarterly basis of all IDPA clients served with State money, their IDPA case numbers, and the activity in which they are enrolled. This information is then sent to IDPA who matches it against a file of Project Chance participants to claim Federal JOBS matching funds. The information is also used to check on coding discrepancies between IDPA and Education records. At the end of the year, IDPA reports to Education any case closings or grant reductions for IDPA clients served by Education. This information is included in Education's annual report and is used to educate legislators on the need for continued support for Education funds to serve IDPA clients.

Some Education funds have been used to hire recruiters to increase the adult education providers' ability to serve Project Chance participants. Every quarter, local IDPA offices give their client listings to these recruiters, who contact each client at least once a year. A provision in the interagency agreement guarding against unauthorized disclosure of information protects client confidentiality.

Some IDPA clients receiving adult education services are not enrolled in Project Chance. Because Federal JOBS funds can be claimed only for IDPA clients who are Project Chance participants, both agencies make an effort to enroll all IDPA clients receiving adult education services. Once a month, local adult education providers give local Project Chance offices a computer-generated list of IDPA clients. Eligible clients who are participating in 20 hours of adult education programs a week are then recruited into Project Chance.

SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

ESTABLISH PARTICIPANT TRACKING INFORMATION EXCHANGES

- The Department of Social Services (DSS), adult education providers, and the PIC developed an educational MIS.

- DSS and community colleges (the assessment contractors) developed an MIS to report on participant assessments.

The Greater Avenues for Independence (GAIN) program, California's JOBS program, is a State-supervised, county-administered system. Each County DSS office administers its GAIN program under regulations and guidelines established by the State.

San Diego GAIN participants go through a sequence of activities: remediation, job search, vocational training, and work experience. The San Diego GAIN program contracts some of these services out to local agencies. As in Illinois, the San Diego DSS must obtain data from its contractors to track GAIN participants. The GAIN Information System (GIS), a system used by a consortium of California counties, permits some tracking of GAIN participants. However, the GIS records only the activity status of the participant. For example, the GIS would indicate that a participant was involved in an adult education activity but would not indicate the participant's attendance or progress. DSS needed its contractors to transmit more complete information.

EDUCATIONAL MIS

The adult education providers in San Diego have formed the GAIN Remediation Adult Deliverers (GRAD) Consortium. *(For more detail on the GRAD Consortium, please see Challenge 6.)* The GRAD Consortium consists of four school districts and two community college districts. The GRAD Consortium, the PIC and DSS jointly designed a program to expedite educational services to GAIN participants through learning centers. As part of this process, these agencies developed an educational MIS. The MIS permitted DSS contractors to provide the agency with more complete information about GAIN participants.

Like the design of San Diego GAIN's educational services in general, the development of an educational MIS was a collaborative process. An MIS sub-committee, consisting of GRAD Consortium members and representatives of DSS and the PIC, met to plan the system.

A one-time start-up grant from the State DSS was used to hire a consultant to develop the system. A staff member from DSS worked closely with the

consultant to make sure the system met DSS' reporting requirements, and together they regularly obtained the approval of the educational MIS subcommittee for the planned system. Design features of the educational MIS include the ability to:

- Track participants among the various learning centers and between other activities and the learning centers;

- Aggregate data from the learning centers;

- Report on student attendance, performance and progress; and

- Produce aggregate reports sorted by period, by district, by learning center, or by GAIN case manager.

GRAD consortium members were sensitive to DSS' data needs. In turn, DSS was cognizant of the fact that adult education providers who served GAIN participants would be subject to greater reporting demands. Together, DSS and the GRAD Consortium calculated what would be required for the learning centers to maintain the system, and DSS agreed to compensate adult education providers through an excess-cost contract. The excess-cost contract augments the funds adult education providers receive per student served. It includes funds for part-time MIS clerks to handle paperwork and data entry and for instructional aids to obtain information on the occasional GAIN participant not receiving educational services at one of the learning centers.

The PIC was one funder of the learning centers and part of the team responsible for collaboration in San Diego. The PIC provided funds for maintenance of the educational MIS after the start-up grant from DSS was exhausted. When GRAD members said the educational MIS needed continued funding, the PIC agreed to provide a portion of JTPA Educational Coordination Grant (8%) monies the Governor had designated to serve GAIN participants. To meet its data needs on performance outcomes, the PIC also arranged for the educational MIS to be modified. The PIC receives quarterly reports on GAIN participants who are also enrolled in JTPA.

Learning centers enter information on referrals, attendance and test scores directly into the MIS. The entire data base is transmitted to DSS, which can generate reports for each learning center, each educational component (such as ABE or GED), each adult education provider, and all adult education providers combined. DSS can also use the data from the educational MIS to produce special reports such as an analysis of the time participants take to complete programs, broken down by adult education providers or educational component.

GAIN ASSESSMENT

First year GAIN start-up funds were used to develop GAIN ASSESSMENT, an MIS that tracks the vocational assessments of GAIN participants. Four community colleges conduct the vocational assessments, which are comprehensive evaluations that include paper-and-pencil tests and inventories, work sampling, and individual interviews.

The deans of the community colleges, DSS, and a computer programmer were the primary planners of GAIN ASSESSMENT. As with the educational MIS, assessment contractors enter data at their own site. The data include referral date, assessment date, assessor's name, number of times the GAIN participant missed an appointment, number of hours the assessment took, and recommended occupations and their DOT codes. GAIN ASSESSMENT also provides DSS with a narrative report on non-quantifiable assessment results in areas such as concentration, attitudes, and work ethic. Both DSS and the community colleges can perform analyses, such as sorting the data base by occupational codes, to see if certain assessors have a tendency to recommend particular occupations and GAIN activities.

CHALLENGE 5:

Building Quality Assurance And Accountability

One of the biggest hurdles agencies have to overcome in coordinating services is their reluctance to relinquish control. When they turn over or contract services out to other agencies, they usually have an uneasy feeling that accountability is slipping through their fingers. This can be especially difficult in the JOBS program because welfare agencies must maintain ultimate responsibility for services which may be provided by a variety of different agencies. As the implementation of the JOBS program progresses, it becomes increasingly important to assure that quality is high and agencies are accountable for services provided. Coordination partnerships can use several mechanisms to achieve this oversight.

These mechanisms might include joint monitoring and contracting procedures, developing performance standards or other benchmarks for performance-based contracting, and clearly describing and assigning responsibility for the services each

SUMMARY

The two States in this challenge have developed systems that allow them to ensure and maintain program quality and accountability. Both Massachusetts and Pennsylvania have State-level organizations with oversight responsibility, and both rely on interagency team meetings to keep close tabs on local program performance and participant progress.

Massachusetts' interagency agreements clearly specify quality and performance standards. The agreements also provide the monitoring methods that will be used, including joint monitoring, site visits and annual reviews. The Regional Employment Boards which have broad oversight responsibility serve as an additional quality assurance mechanism.

Pennsylvania provides overall management of the Single Point of Contact (SPOC) program which is part of its JOBS program, through the Joint Jobs Initiative Task Force, made up of representatives from human services, education and labor. This Task Force sets guidelines for the SPOCs, annually reviews their performance and exercises options for corrective action when there are deficiencies. Local Management Committees manage the individual SPOC centers and are responsible for monitoring the SPOC to ensure compliance with their contract.

MASSACHUSETTS

STATE LEVEL OVERSIGHT FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY

- o Interagency agreements between the Department of Public Welfare (DPW) and Department of Employment and Training (DET) specified services provided and expected results.

- o DPW and DET developed a highly structured system for monitoring local performance.

- o The Regional Employment Boards (REB's) have oversight responsibility for local JOBS employment and training programs.

LOCAL LEVEL OVERSIGHT FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY

- o Interagency "Quartet" Meetings identify and address operational issues.

The small staff of the Mass JOBS Division of DPW is responsible for administering the Massachusetts JOBS program. Primarily a contract management unit, the Mass JOBS Division negotiates and monitors intra-agency and interagency agreements for JOBS services. Mass JOBS staff duties include allocating funds among service providers and setting their performance goals as well as coordinating JOBS with other agencies and operating the JOBS MIS.

MASS JOBS/DET AGREEMENT

DPW has three interagency agreements with DET to provide the majority of JOBS education, training and placement services. The primary agreement defines the overall relationship between DPW and DET. The other two agreements detail how the services are actually delivered--through the SDA's and the Employment Service (ES). SDA's in turn deliver services through the JTPA system and community-based organizations. ES, a part of DET, directly provides job search, development and placement exclusively for JOBS participants through a special unit--the Employment Network.

A variety of provisions in the agreements ensure that DET is held accountable for providing quality services:

- The agreements are performance based. DET gets reimbursed according to the number of participants it serves and is further compensated for JOBS participants who attain positive outcomes.

- Goals and standards are clearly Stated. Examples include:

- 70% of participants who terminate are to achieve positive outcomes.

- For those participants placed in jobs, 85% are to be placed in training-related jobs and 90% must have health benefits.

- No more than 10% of positive outcomes can be education placements.

- DET submits weekly, monthly, quarterly and final reports to DPW. These reports contain data on enrollments, attendance, placements,and performance, and compare planned versus actual outcomes.

- Meetings are held to discuss program performance and review the operation of the agreements. There is a performance review of costs and outcomes every six months. A DPW Assistant Commissioner and a DET Deputy Commissioner meet at least quarterly. There are monthly meetings to review activities as well as weekly local interagency meetings ("Quartet Meetings").

- DET agrees to allow DPW to inspect its programs, procedures, files, records and premises periodically.

- DET assumes primary responsibility to monitor SDA plans and programs. However, DPW and DET make joint monitoring visits to service sites.

- DPW can notify DET of performance deficiencies and request corrective action. If DET fails to take corrective action, DPW may withhold a portion of DET's payment or terminate the agreements.

STRUCTURE FOR State MONITORING

DET is accountable to DPW for the quality of the services it agreed to provide. The first step of DET's oversight procedure is to establish clear goals for each agency. DET accomplishes this task at its Statewide annual planning meeting attended by the regional ES offices, SDA's, and local DPW offices.

DET sets Statewide performance standards and gives each SDA its own specific standards that are adjusted for local conditions. SDA's procure comprehensive employment and training services from local providers and are responsible for the quality of their individual programs.

A reporting system also contributes to maintaining accountability. SDA's and ES submit monthly statistical progress reports to DET, which then submits them to Mass JOBS. Mass JOBS cross-checks the reports for accuracy and

consistency with those from the local DPW offices. ES and the SDA's receive feedback on the reports from DET field representatives (who function as liaisons with the SDA's).

Another cross-check on ES' performance is provided by the structure of ES' arrangements for JOBS service delivery. ES out-stations a placement counselor at each DPW field office. This arrangement was designed to allow counselors to become specialists at placing JOBS participants. However, it also permits DPW to observe the counselors, thus providing an added measure of oversight.

Joint monitoring teams from DET and Mass JOBS make annual visits to each SDA and DPW field office to review their ability to deliver quality services and to verify the monthly statistical reports. The teams look at records and client tracking. They select JOBS vendors at random and talk to participants, counselors and instructors. A monitoring report on each visit identifies strengths and weaknesses and recommends corrective action. DET field representatives make site visits to follow up on the corrective action recommendations.

The State DET office receives monthly statistical and narrative analyses from its field representatives. DET may withhold or reduce an SDA's JOBS funds for failure to respond to corrective action recommendations within negotiated time frames. Within the terms of its agreements with DPW, DET is free to re-allocate funds from regions with poor performance to those achieving or exceeding their goals.

REGIONAL EMPLOYMENT BOARDS

REB's are PICs with broader powers mandated by the State Legislature. The private sector makes up 51% of the REB's, which include representation from education, organized labor, the regional Employment Service and DPW offices. The REB's are an additional quality assurance mechanism for JOBS programs. REB's are a mechanism through which all plans and proposals, for all employment-oriented education and training programs that receive State or Federal dollars and establish local workforce development goals are coordinated.

While DPW has overall responsibility for both the design and operation of the JOBS program, the REB's also develop comprehensive employment and training plans for their regions, issue RFPs (developed by the SDA's), approve contract terms and monitor the performance of JTPA, JOBS and other programs for which they have financial responsibility. They conduct oversight through a compilation of the SDA reports submitted to DET and updates at each meeting. REB's can also ask vendors to attend meetings to report on

progress or explain programs.

The welfare REB representative (who is the local DPW office manager) must also approve JOBS plans, proposals and contracts in terms of the service level for priority target groups and appropriateness of planned services for JOBS participants.

QUARTET MEETINGS

One primary mechanism for assuring quality and accountability is the local "Quartet Meetings" required by the DPW-DET agreement. The name is derived from the four agencies--ES, the SDA, local DPW field office and local Child Care Resource and Referral Office--whose senior staff attend the weekly meetings. The purpose of these meetings is to provide early problem intervention and resolution. The representatives review data on referrals, enrollments and placements, and develop coordinated strategies to address problems. If the SDA, for example, identifies a program quality problem with a vendor through its normal monitoring process that it cannot resolve satisfactorily, the SDA representative will bring the problem to the Quartet Meetings. The representatives at these meetings are people who can take immediate measures to solve problems that cannot be handled at lower levels.

PENNSYLVANIA

STATE LEVEL OVERSIGHT FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY

- o A joint Jobs Initiative Task Force manages overall program, approves local program design, and monitors local performance.

LOCAL LEVEL OVERSIGHT FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY

- o Local Management Committees (LMC's) manage local programs and resolve quality problems that cannot be addressed at lower levels.

- o Direct Service Teams identify problems in program quality and refer any problems outside their authority to the LMC.

As part of its JOBS program, Pennsylvania created SPOC--Single Point of Contact. SPOC focuses on:

- Co-locating services and staff from JTPA, Job Service and the local Department of Public Welfare County Assistance Office (CAO)

- Intensified case management

- Specifically developed remediation, training and support services for welfare recipients who have serious barriers to employment.

Services co-located at the CAO include SPOC orientation, employability assessment, employment and training referrals, JTPA eligibility determination, case management, and job search assistance for job-ready clients. The CAO, SDA and Job Service all provide staff for these activities.

JOINT JOBS INITIATIVE TASK FORCE AND LMC's

A State level Joint Jobs Initiative Task Force composed of members from the Departments of Labor and Industry (DLI), Education, and Public Welfare (DPW) manages the SPOC program. Every two years, the Task Force issues guidelines for SPOC stipulating the range of services that must be available. New services, policies, and procedures are established by consensus. IV-A administrative control is assured because the DPW Director of Employment and Training is responsible for issuing all instructions to the field, including program design, participation requirements, and other policies governing the program. DPW also retains responsibility for all decisions concerning individuals, including exemption status, good cause for failure to participate,

sanctions, and fair hearings.

LMC's, each responsible for managing a SPOC site, respond by preparing a proposal outlining the level of service it can provide and requesting an allocation. LMC's are composed of decision-making-level representatives from the SDA, CAO, Job Service and local education agency. They jointly administer the program at the SPOCs. When the Task Force accepts an LMC's proposal, it then negotiates specific terms for the two-year contract with the individual LMC. The Task Force sets funding allocations based on local case load and performance of previous programs.

The LMC's are responsible for monitoring each SPOC to ensure compliance with their contract. Their oversight system for SPOC is informal and aims at achieving consensus among participating agencies. The LMC's are required to meet monthly to address issues such as program design, staffing levels, choice of vendors, attendance policies, assessment procedures and program monitoring. One of their functions is to foster constant communication among participating agencies on any issues that might affect a participant's success in achieving economic self-sufficiency, including poor quality programs. The LMC's rely heavily on constant communication with their separate agency staff and among themselves to oversee service providers and develop consensus in devising strategies to correct problems. The interagency structure enables them to cross check each other's services and those of vendors.

To ensure overall quality, the Task Force reviews the contract at the end of the first year to determine whether each LMC is meeting performance standard guidelines, complying with contract program design, and making maximum use of its funds. Staff from DPW and DLI conduct field monitoring visits, review minutes of monthly LMC meetings, and analyze data before deciding second-year allocation status.

If there are serious deficiencies, the Task Force may select one of three options: probation, reduction in funds, or contract cancellation. Programs on probation receive intensive technical assistance through additional site visits, training sessions, special performance analyses, and close monitoring of corrective action plans. The LMC contract is modified to reflect the negotiated changes needed to bring the program into compliance with performance standards.

DIRECT SERVICE TEAMS

The LMC's primary source of information is the Direct Service Teams. Every SPOC program must create these teams, which are responsible for obtaining participant services. Mirroring the membership of the State level Task Force, the Direct Service Teams consist of field staff from the SDA, CAO, Job Service

and a local education agency. In some instances, a vendor might also be on a team. Each SPOC program has multiple Direct Service Teams reporting to the LMC. Team members rely on their constant contact with participants to spot program quality problems. Individually, they talk to participants and service providers about the programs.

Each team then conducts regularly scheduled case conferences to review individual participant progress and discuss any program problems. Teams also submit summary reports to the LMC's.

Again, communication is the key to assuring quality and accountability. The teams' attitude is, "If we talk all the time to participants about the programs and to each other about participant status, then we can identify and solve program quality problems quickly." Teams are empowered to fix problems within their purview. The LMC is responsible for resolving problems the Team cannot address.

CHALLENGE 6:
Providing Appropriate And Quality Services

This challenge addresses the development and operation of quality service programs for JOBS participants through fully coordinated service delivery. Although the four State and local examples in this section cover a wide spectrum of approaches, they do have a common denominator--a focus on providing the most comprehensive, high quality services possible in order to help JOBS participants reach the goal of self-sufficiency.

SUMMARY

Kenosha County, Wisconsin, created a Job Center to co-locate a variety of services, including child care for participants, provided by eight different agencies. The center uses joint intake and assessment to eliminate duplication of effort. A four-level participant classification system is used to ensure that appropriate services are delivered to JOBS participants. Case managers monitor participants closely as they move through the different training levels.

San Diego County, California formed the GRAD Consortium which consists of four school districts and two community colleges that operate 18 learning centers in the county. The Centers provide remedial education to JOBS participants and were jointly planned and implemented by the GRAD Consortium, Department of Social Services and PIC representatives.

New York created ACCESS Centers and ACCESS Consortia in urban and rural sites across the state to provide co-located or coordinated education, job training and supportive services using a network of providers. These programs were jointly planned and funded by the State Department of Social Services and Education to improve the employability of AFDC recipients through better access to education and training. However, the design and focus of the centers are determined at the local level.

Oklahoma also used a network of service providers--OSU/Okmulgee, Eastern PIC and Job Corps--in developing programs tailored to meet the needs of JOBS special populations. The Okmulgee Family Enhancement Program provides post-secondary education and training for selected AFDC participants. The Job Corps 2 Program operating in Oklahoma City and Tulsa is designed for single mothers and provides basic skills education and OJT with job placement assistance.

SUMMARY (Cont'd)

Five key factors were the basis for developing the high quality services in these examples.

Attitude of Cooperation--The projects worked in large part because the designers wanted them to work. They believed that turf issues and other barriers would be surmounted and they were.

Tangible Gain--All the agencies involved in these coordination efforts knew that everyone would gain from them, particularly JOBS participants. In these examples, coordination made more efficient use of resources or made more resources available, increased enrollment and made services more accessible to participants.

Training--Staffs in the various coordinating agencies were prepared for the changes that would come with coordination. Joint training sessions provided them with more skills and helped them operate more effectively.

Incremental Approach--Implementing changes slowly to find the "bugs" and to help people adjust to a new system smooths out the transition.

Joint Funding--The programs described in this section have multiple sources of funding. Contributing financially to a program gave the funders a substantial interest in the program's success.

Collaborative Planning--The examples in this section used interagency planning and found it to be crucial. Collaborative planning promotes joint ownership of and commitment to coordinated programs.

KENOSHA COUNTY, WISCONSIN

PLANNING AND OPERATING A COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

- o Planning was done by the local Department of Social Services (DSS) with political backing.
- o Interagency planning and training was used to overcome philosophic and turf issues and promote joint ownership.
- o Incremental implementation helped staff adjust to changes.
- o Interagency management reinforced all agencies sense of performance ownership.

IMPROVED ACCESSIBILITY OF SERVICES

- o Single service center has co-located eight agencies.
- o Joint intake, assessment and unified delivery system are provided.

TAILORED SERVICES

- o Initial assessment is used to identify participants with special needs

The Kenosha County JOBS program provides an outstanding example of a high-quality, fully integrated service delivery system. JOBS services are provided through a Job Center that houses the county DSS and staff from seven other agencies that collectively offer the full range of services JOBS participants need. These seven agencies operate under separate contract to DSS. From the participant's perspective, however, the Job Center is a single program providing a unified network of services. There is a common reception area and telephone system and a joint AFDC/JOBS application process. Staff from the participating agencies are not seated in separate areas. Instead, they are co-mingled throughout the Center to facilitate communication and building common caseloads. The staffs share the Center's philosophy and mission of empowering JOBS participants to achieve economic self-sufficiency through meaningful employment.

DSS PLANNING WITH POLITICAL SUPPORT

The impetus for developing the Job Center was a community crisis--the announced closing in 1987 of a Chrysler assembly plant, a major employer. The county executive was concerned that the plant closing would place a severe burden on the county social services system.

At the same time, DSS was planning the JOBS program in anticipation of the passage of the Family Support Act. Both DSS and the county executive were interested in developing a co-located center to provide more efficient, intensive service to participants, thereby reducing the time needed to achieve self-sufficiency. With the county political establishment's backing, DSS began developing the Job Center by forming a planning committee consisting of its contractors (who were later housed in the Job Center) and other community employment and training providers.

INTERAGENCY PLANNING AND TRAINING

DSS realized that successful collaboration among agencies required overcoming the stereotypical views one agency held about another, turf issues and different perceptions about participants. An important element of the planning process was a series of interagency sessions designed to address issues of philosophy, interagency collaboration and operation. In these sessions:

- Interagency staff met to plan the Job Center's policies and projects, creating a sense of project ownership. Interagency work groups decided everything from seating arrangements and smoking policies to service delivery approaches.

- Formal education was provided about each staff member's function.

- Understanding each other's roles helped reduced negative stereotypes.

- In-service training, including group interaction and problem-solving sessions, allowed staff to learn to work together.

DSS developed a mission Statement and goals for the program on which all agencies agreed. Adopting these goals promoted a feeling of project ownership among agencies and ensured that each agency would be committed to the Job Center's purpose and function. *(See Appendix E for a copy of Kenosha's Declaration of Commitment.)*

INCREMENTAL IMPLEMENTATION

The Job Center planning proceeded in stages to help the staff adjust to the changes and to working together. DSS established a pilot Job Center staffed with six volunteer economic support specialists from the Income Maintenance staff. When these staff members saw how well co-location worked, they eagerly helped convince other workers of the benefits of interagency cooperation as the Center expanded and more staff was added.

MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE

The Job Center's management structure reinforces all agencies' sense of program ownership. The Program Management Group consists of a single upper level management representative from each of the involved agencies and is chaired by the DSS director. This group meets monthly to focus on strategic and operational program goals, funding, interagency problem solving, program improvements and building consensus. At the operational level, the Job Center Management Group, which is composed of managers from each participating agency, is responsible for coordinating day-to-day system delivery activities.

The DSS JOBS program manager leads this group, which meets weekly to monitor progress toward operational goals and objectives. Meetings serve as forums to keep staff informed of and involved in Job Center activities and decisions. Line staff also holds formal and informal interagency case conferences to resolve any issues that arise during direct service delivery. The joint program management at all levels is an important component of program success. It demonstrates the importance of being an active and effective team player and the need for interagency commitment to make the program work. The management structure also facilitates marshaling interagency resources to meet JOBS program objectives.

CO-LOCATED SERVICES

The Job Center became fully operational in December 1989 with eight co-located agencies integrated into a unified delivery system:

- **DSS**--including JOBS and Income Maintenance

- **Goodwill Industries**--provides orientation, case management, motivational workshops, child care coordination, transportation and Community Work Experience Program (CWEP) coordination

- **Wisconsin Job Service** (both the JOBS and Kenosha County units)--responsible for labor exchange functions, job search, job development and placement

- **Professional Services Group, Inc.**--performs vocational and academic assessment

- **Gateway Technical College**--provides customized training, vocational education and counseling

- **SER-Jobs-for-Progress**--provides adult basic education, remediation, GED preparation and ESL instruction

- **LJJ Management Services**--responsible for managing program operations

- **Kenosha County Child Support Agency**--responsible for child support enforcement

In addition to these agencies, the local PIC is moving to the Center, and there is an on-site child care facility for children of participants involved in Center activities.

Co-location of services makes it convenient and easy for participants to access services and prevents them from "falling through the cracks" while moving from agency to agency.

JOINT INTAKE, ASSESSMENT AND SERVICE DELIVERY

The Kenosha County JOBS program uses a four-level participant classification system to ensure that appropriate services are delivered. The intake worker makes the initial classification. Level I participants are job ready and assigned only to job search and motivational activities. Most participants are Level II--needing work experience and education--and are assigned to the Workfirst training track. Level III participants have serious barriers to employment, such as alcohol or drug abuse or mental health problems. They are referred for further assessment and services before being assigned to the Workfirst training track. Level IV participants have employment barriers that may not be remedial, such as serious physical disabilities. These individuals may be exempted from JOBS requirements or referred to the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Workfirst involves participants quickly, intensely and for a sustained period of time. There is joint AFDC/JOBS eligibility determination at intake. Mandatory Level I and Level II JOBS participants are informed immediately about JOBS requirements and scheduled for orientation the following Friday and motivational and job seeking skills workshops the next Monday.

The motivation and job seeking workshops last three weeks. Participants are assessed and their employability plans developed during the workshop. Most participants then enter the job search component for six weeks in conjunction with remedial or vocational education. Participants who are more job ready may receive customized training from Gateway Technical College.

There are follow-up motivational workshops during this six-week period, and participants work closely with a case manager who provides guidance and identifies problems that may affect participation in the program.

Participants who are not employed at the end of the six-week job search segment are assigned to CWEP, OJT or work supplementation for up to three months. Remedial or vocational education continues during this period, as do follow-up motivational workshops. Participants with multiple barriers to employment are often identified during this period and referred to a special case manager who functions as a community resource specialist. This case manager arranges for additional, more intensive services within the community that participants may need. If the participant is still not employed at the end of this period, the EDP is reviewed and the participant is reassigned to the appropriate service track.

SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

PLANNING AND OPERATING A COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

- o The Department of Social Services (DSS), PIC and county educational institutions developed a single education consortium.
- o Educational agencies manage components jointly.

IMPROVED ACCESSIBILITY OF SERVICES

- o Community learning centers were established throughout the county.
- o Child care referral is co-located at GAIN offices.

TAILORED SERVICES

- o Educational program for JOBS participants was designed and expedited.

GAIN is California's JOBS program, which is operated by the County DSS. DSS is responsible for JOBS participant intake and provides orientation, assessment, employability plan development and case management. DSS operates a job club and job search activities, along with work experience activities. All other services are provided through contracts with other agencies, including the PIC, the State Employment Development Department (EDD), school districts and community colleges.

After orientation, JOBS participants enter the program's job search or education activities. Job search activities consist of the job club and job search supplemented with job development. Job placement assistance is provided by EDD, which has staff located in the county DSS office. The PIC, Regional Occupational program and private organizations provide skills training and OJT placements to participants who need additional job training. DSS case managers monitor participant progress during job search activity.

SINGLE EDUCATION CONSORTIUM

During GAIN's planning phase, DSS administrators invited the PIC and all school districts and community colleges in the county to jointly plan for providing remedial education to GAIN participants. Initially, more than 10 colleges and school districts expressed a strong interest in becoming involved. After attending a series of meetings with DSS and PIC staff, two of the community college districts and four of the high school districts united to form the GAIN Remediation Adult Deliverers (GRAD) Consortium.

DSS, the PIC and the GRAD Consortium worked together to develop a plan for delivering education services to GAIN participants. DSS staff identified the four key factors in developing the GRAD Consortium:

- DSS had a history of working successfully with local school districts and the PIC on earlier programs such as the Employment Preparation Program (EPP) and Saturation Work Initiative Model (SWIM). Thus, many key players knew each other and had worked together previously.

- San Diego's geographic location--isolated from the rest of the State by the ocean, Mexico, the desert, and Camp Pendelton in the north--made service providers believe they must work together to solve problems and not depend on State or other outside resources.

- The people involved in the GRAD Consortium's development had a strong personal commitment to making the program a success.

- All participants saw each other as equals and brought their collective experience together in a collaborative manner. The planners were committed to applying the model uniformly in the six school districts.

TAILORED SERVICES

Since traditional classroom settings require too much time for GAIN participants to meet their educational goals, DSS, the PIC and the GRAD Consortium developed a model of computerized learning centers to expedite the learning process. This model was pilot-tested in three learning centers financed by JTPA Education Coordination Grant (8%) funds. The pilot's success led to establishing 18 GAIN Learning Centers offering adult basic education, GED preparation and ESL instruction. The learning centers are jointly funded by JOBS, the JTPA 8% and the GRAD Consortium's school districts which operate the centers.

COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTERS

The 18 GRAD Consortium Learning Centers are spread throughout the county. Many are located in storefronts, which makes them more inviting to those who are discouraged by a traditional school environment. Learning center staff assesses each GAIN participant and develops an individual education plan that addresses personal needs and goals. Instruction is also individualized and includes computer-assisted instruction with State-of-the-art software. Special services are also available for participants with learning disabilities. Specialized DSS case managers work closely with center staff to ensure that the participant's needs are met and to identify and solve problems that may affect attendance and progress.

JOINT MANAGEMENT OF CENTERS

The GRAD Consortium meets monthly to monitor the quality of services provided in the Learning Centers, discuss policy, and resolve problems. The GRAD Consortium uses subcommittees to deal with such issues as funding, contracts, enrollment problems, curriculum and record keeping, management information systems, and reporting requirements.

Joint management of the learning centers means that there are no turf battles. Furthermore, the school districts have pooled their expertise, thus improving the quality of services provided. Joint management also simplifies program administration. DSS has to deal with only a single entity regarding education services for JOBS participants. Although separate contracts are executed between DSS and each school district, the contracts are identical because the GRAD Consortium has negotiated a single agreement.

NEW YORK

PLANNING AND OPERATING A COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

- State interagency initiative led to the development of an integrated service system.
- Joint funding is provided by the State Department of Social Services (DSS), Education Department (ED) and Department of Labor.
- Planning and operation of centers are done at the local level.

IMPROVED ACCESSIBILITY OF SERVICES

- Service centers offer co-located or coordinated education and support services.

State-LED INTERAGENCY INITIATIVE

The New York State Education Department and the Department of Social Services have formed a partnership to develop a more complete array of education, employment and support services to prepare adults, particularly public assistance recipients, for employment and self-sufficiency. At the cornerstone of this commitment is the establishment of Adult Centers for Comprehensive Education and Support Services (ACCESS) to expand services to adult students throughout New York State.

ACCESS AGENCIES

ACCESS Agencies are local educational agencies or institutions which provide a variety of educational and training programs, counseling, assessment and support services to meet the education, training and retraining needs of a wide range of adults. Emphasis is on improving services through better use of existing State and Federal funds. ACCESS Agencies provide core educational components which include:

- Adult basic education, English as second language and high school equivalency instruction;
- Non-degree adult occupational training in areas of labor market need;
- Life management instruction (e.g., employability skills, parenting, health and nutrition); and
- Customized short-time training for business and industry.

IMPROVED ACCESSIBILITY OF SERVICES

At the heart of ACCESS Agencies are the education and support services that help to meet the individual needs of adults, and link separate components into a continuum of service. There are six basic components:

- Full-time case management and counseling which assist each adult in designing a program of education, training and job placement, taking into account her other special needs, interests and goals;

- Comprehensive educational assessment and career counseling and development services which are available to serve the whole community;

- On-site child care which allows parents with young children to more readily participate in educational programs;

- Parent education and family literacy programs; and

- Job development and placement services such as job clubs, job shadowing and referral to on-the-job training.

ACCESS CONSORTIA

In some areas, rather than a single agency providing these comprehensive educational and support services a lead education agency will network with other educational agencies and service providers to ensure that a full range of services is available to adult students in a particular service area. Any one of these agencies can do initial intake and then refer the adult student to the most appropriate agency in the network or consortium for services. These agencies are referred to as ACCESS Consortia.

ACCESS CENTERS

In large metropolitan areas and other geographic locations which have a concentration of the target population, both ACCESS Agencies and ACCESS Consortia have been encouraged to locate all education, training and support services in a single location, creating an adult school. This school, called an ACCESS Center, is open morning through evening, six days a week throughout the year and is managed by an on-site principal or ACCESS Center Director.

COORDINATION AND INTEGRATION OF SERVICES

The ACCESS initiative stresses the importance of coordination of services to

eliminate duplication and to make the services easier to access. ACCESS Agencies and Consortia work closely with local departments of social services, including State initiatives under the Comprehensive Employment Program (CEP) and coordination with the Comprehensive Employment Opportunity Support Centers (CEOSC). Several ACCESS Agencies/Consortia provide close coordination with an economic development zone and focus on services to individuals and companies in that zone.

Similarly, ACCESS Agencies/Consortia have developed reciprocal referral arrangements with the local employment and training community including the local service delivery area (SDA) under JTPA, which administers employment training and related services through a partnership between the local government and Private Industry Council. In addition ACCESS Agencies/Consortia work with the regional offices of the Department of Labor and the Community Service Centers established by the Department of Labor throughout the State to provide comprehensive employment services.

JOINT FUNDING BY STATE DSS, ED AND DOL

Multiple funding sources are used to fund these initiatives. Joint funding efforts require that the ACCESS Agencies/Consortia blend these sources to create an integrated system of services for adult students. Funds used to support the ACCESS initiative include the Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act (VATEA), the Adult Education Act (AEA), Welfare Education Program (WEP), the Adult Literacy Education program (ALE), Education for Gainful Employment (EDGE), and the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA). In addition, funds administered by the State Office for the Aging have been used to support the ACCESS initiatives as have funds administered by the Office of Vocational and Educational Services for Adults with Disabilities (VESID) under the Rehabilitation Act.

DSS AND ED LOCAL LEVEL PLANNING

ACCESS and ACCESS Consortia Centers are planned and operated at the local level. The State requires ACCESS Centers to be operated in partnership with the local DSS. DSS must be substantively involved in planning and developing the center as well as operating it. In addition to co-location requirements, ACCESS Centers must coordinate with other employment and training programs in the community, such as Job Service and the PIC, Vocational Rehabilitation agencies and social services agencies.

Educational agencies receiving ACCESS Consortia funds must establish cooperative working relationships with off-site service providers to create a network of supportive services that supplements the educational services. These providers include the local DSS office, local PIC, and Community

Service Centers established by the New York Department of Labor. ACCESS Agencies and ACCESS Consortia serve EDGE participants as specified by arrangements between the county DSS and the local education agency. There is no Statewide agreement regulating coordination between EDGE, ACCESS Agencies and ACCESS Consortia. In most counties, ACCESS Centers and ACCESS Consortia sites provide basic education to EDGE participants. ACCESS Centers also provide job training and placement for EDGE in some counties.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ACCESS AGENCIES/CONSORTIA SITES

After three full years of operation the number of ACCESS Agencies/Consortia has increased from 38 to 55.

During 1990-91, the following number of adults received services:

- Approximately 16,500 adults received counseling and assessment services at ACCESS Agencies/Consortia.
- Approximately 7,900 adults received case management services.
- Approximately 2,500 adults used the on-site child care centers serving over 3,300 children.
- Approximately 69,500 adults received literacy instruction and 62,000 adults received occupational education and training at the agencies and institutions designated as ACCESS Agencies or Consortia.

OKLAHOMA

PLANNING AND OPERATING A COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

- Family Enhancement Program planned and funded by the Department of Human Services (DHS), Eastern PIC and Oklahoma State University (OSU)/Okmulgee.

- The Job Corps 2 Program is planned and operated by DHS Job Corps and State Employment Office.

IMPROVED ACCESSIBILITY OF SERVICES

- The Residential Family Enhancement Program provides seamless services.

TAILORED SERVICES

- Post-secondary education prepares participants for non-traditional, high-paying careers.

- Modified Job Corps program serves AFDC mothers.

The Family Enhancement Program and Job Corps 2 Program in Oklahoma illustrate the use of local agencies to provide services tailored to special JOBS participants. The Oklahoma programs are designed to supplement mainstream activities for JOBS subpopulations.

FAMILY ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM

The Family Enhancement Program began as a pilot project in 1990 to provide opportunities for post-secondary education to single parents who qualify as AFDC recipients. It is coordinated by three main partners, OSU/Okmulgee, DHS and the Eastern PIC, Inc.

The impetus for the project was the DOL publication *Working Capital* which addressed major coordination issues, etc. After reading the report, the OSU/Okmulgee vice-president was motivated to address some of the issues it raised by developing a new program for the disadvantaged. He scheduled a series of meetings with the State JOBS director and the executive director of the Eastern PIC to discuss how their organizations could appropriately respond to the report. They were especially concerned with developing a new program to help AFDC recipients become economically self-sufficient. The Family Enhancement Program was the result of these three administrators efforts.

The Family Enhancement program is not for everyone. It requires a two-year commitment and an interest in pursuing post-secondary education. There are admission criteria as well. Staff at DHS offices throughout the State are responsible for identifying candidates for the program, including JOBS participants. To be considered for the program, participants must be AFDC parents and have a high school diploma or a GED. They must meet OSU/Okmulgee admission standards and take college entrance exams. They must also apply for student financial aid. Anyone who has defaulted on previous educational loans is not eligible.

There are four steps to the admission process after a candidate has been identified:

- PIC counselors help the candidates complete the application forms and schedule additional tests to evaluate aptitude and ambition

- The PIC executive director evaluates the application forms and refers eligible candidates to the PIC liaison at OSU/Okmulgee

- A PIC liaison contacts candidates and schedules a campus visit

- Staff at DHS, the PIC and OSU/Okmulgee meet to select who will be invited to participate in the program

After students have been admitted to the program, each of the major partners takes responsibility for providing different types of services:

- DHS provides monthly AFDC support, food stamps, a medical card and child care.

- The PIC helps families relocate to the campus and pays for tuition and books with JTPA funds.

- OSU/Okmulgee provides a program of university classes, advisors, and academic tutoring.

Applicants are admitted to the program at the beginning of each semester at OSU/Okmulgee. Students may enroll in such academic programs as automotive technology, computer information systems, electrical and electronics technology and visual communications. These courses are identified as "non-traditional" career fields that help prepare the students for jobs that offer higher-than-average starting salaries of about $25,000 per year.

Most students earn an associate degree in their chosen field. They typically complete about 90 semester hours of university courses and take two years to complete the program.

Students live in apartments converted from university dormitories. They pay for housing expenses with Pell grants or other student financial aid. They also receive some housing support through monthly AFDC checks.

The Family Enhancement Program is no longer a pilot project but is officially integrated into the ongoing operations of OSU/Okmulgee.

JOB CORPS 2 PROGRAM

Job Corps is a residential education and training program for disadvantaged youth. The Job Corps 2 Program is a pilot project to provide non-residential education, vocational training and other supportive services to young AFDC mothers. This program is of a much shorter duration than the traditional Job Corps programs. Job Corps 2 Programs are operated in Oklahoma City and Tulsa by three main partners, DHS, Job Corps, and the State Employment Office.

Planning the program began with a series of meetings among staff from different State and local agencies. For example, the Oklahoma City meetings had representatives from the DHS, JTPA and area vocational technical schools. These agencies identified the initial goals of the project and defined eligibility standards and other major terms. They also developed an administrative plan outlining the steps necessary to begin the project. When the plan was completed, the partners applied for and received a Federal grant from DOL to implement the program.

Like the Family Enhancement Program, the Job Corps 2 Program is not for everyone. Applicants must be women between 18 to 24 years old who are interested in the training program, have dependent children and qualify for AFDC support. DHS staff in Tulsa and Oklahoma City recruit candidates they feel may be suited for this program. Candidates are referred to the State Employment Office, which is contracted by the Job Corps to screen applicants, register participants and process the paperwork. DHS then gives participants a four-day motivational workshop and orientation about the program.

After a woman enters the program, she attends two days of orientation meetings. Project staff discusses the different vocational training offerings. The participants' basic academic skill levels are evaluated. The training program itself consists of basic skills instruction and OJT.

Participants enroll in an OJT program while taking the basic skills classes. They may receive training in such fields as business and clerical services, graphic arts and welding. The OJT lasts an average of six weeks. While in training, participants receive a training allowance from Job Corps for their transportation and miscellaneous expenses. DHS pays for day care at State-licensed facilities. Staff from all three agencies cooperate to identify potential employers and help program graduates find jobs in the community.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

NEW HAMPSHIRE

INTERAGENCY REFERRAL FORM

State of New Hampshire

Interagency Referral/Work Registration

Casehead Name _____ (First MI Last)

Client Name _____ (First MI Last)

Mailing Address _____

Town/City _____ State ____ Zip ____

SSN (for ID only) _____ Tel. # _____

Referring Agency (check one):
☐ DHS ☐ ES ☐ JTC ☐ DVR ☐ ABE ☐ OTH__

Referred by _____

Office _____ Tel.# _____

Results requested? ☐ Yes ☐ No Send to: _____

☐ Referred for SW Evaluation on |_|_|/|_|_|/|_|_|_|_| (M M / D D / Y Y Y Y)

Referred (MM/DD/YY) |_|_|/|_|_|/|_|_| to (check one): ☐ DHS ☐ DSW ☐ ES ☐ JTC ☐ DVR ☐ ABE ☐ OTH__

Name _____ Date _____

Address _____ Time _____

Reason for Referral/Comments _____

DHS Case # |_|_|_|_|_|_|_|_|_| DHS Indiv. # |_|_|_|_|_|_|_|_|_|_|

FOR DHS ONLY:

1. When this section is completed and this form is signed, the above person is:
   A=Enrolled in JOBS program-AFDC B=Registered for work-FS C=Registered for FS at rede.....|_|
2. Highest grade completed?.....|_|_|
3. Client worked three months or more in the last 12 months? Y=Yes N=No.....|_|
4. Last job ended (MM/DD/YY).....|_|_|/|_|_|/|_|_|
5. Status: A=Applicant Casehead C=Applicant member
   B=Recipient Casehead D=Recipient Member E=Other.....|_|
6. Program: A=AFDC-AP B=MA Only C=MA&FS D=FS Only E=Other.....|_|
7. Referral Status: A=Mandatory B=Voluntary.....|_|
8. JOBS: A=Referred to JTC for GED D=Referred to JTC for Tuition G=OJT J=FIP
   B=Referred to JTC for ABE E=Training Only H=Job Search
   C=Referred to JTC for OTH F=Training/Education I=Job Readiness
   S.W. Mgt: K=Direct TR Placement P=Post Secondary Ed. U=Crisis Resolution
   L=Direct HS Placement Q=Already in HS V=Barrier Resolution
   M=Direct GED Placement R=Already in GED W=Self-initiated Higher Ed.
   N=Direct ABE Placement S=Already in ABE X=Self-initiated Higher Tr.
   O=Direct OTH Placement T=Already in OTH
   |_|

I grant permission for the information on this form, the attachments and any information resulting from this referral to be shared betw _____ and _____. I also grant permission for the follo agencies to share information so they can help me meet my employment, training and education plan: the Division of Human Servi NH Employment Security, NH Job Training Council, the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, and any other agency which can pro a service or resource related to my employability plan. I understand that these agencies will keep information about my c confidential.

Attachments to this form are: _____

Relationship of person named above to person signing, if different _____

Signature _____ Witness _____ Date: _____

RECEIVING AGENCY: PLEASE RESPOND BELOW WITHIN 20 WORKING DAYS:

Choose the decision from below then enter the number of your decision.....|_|

1. Eligible and scheduled to Begin Activity (complete the section below).
2. Eligible but waiting to be scheduled for Activity (schedule to follow on Form 214).
3. Denied for services (please comment - attach new Form 213 if referring to another agency).

If you chose (1) please complete this section:

Activity Code (see back of form for codes) .....|_|

Scheduled Begin date (MM/DD/YY).....|_|_|/|_|_|/|_|_|

Scheduled End date (MM/DD/YY).....|_|_|/|_|_|/|_|_|

Scheduled Number of Hours per week .....|_|_|

Comments: _____

Agency Representative Signature _____ Date (MM/DD/YY) |_|_|/|_|_|/|_|_|

SH1

White - Kevins Canary/Pink/Blue - Receiving Agency/SW Green - Sending Agency Goldenrod - Client

APPENDIX B

IDAHO

GUIDELINES FOR REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCILS

IDAHO:
ESTABLISHING REGIONAL JOBS ADVISORY COMMITTEES

I. GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

It is the goal of the Department of Health and Welfare to have a functioning JOBS Advisory Committee to assist in the development of the Regional JOBS Plan and provide ongoing input regarding the implementation and maintenance of the JOBS program in the Department's seven (7) Service Delivery Regions.

To these ends, each Regional Director shall establish a Regional JOBS Advisory Committee consistent with the following guidelines:

II. DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The Regional JOBS Advisory Committee will be responsible for:

A. Meeting with the Regional Director and other regional staff to identify existing resources which will complement the JOBS program and to identify unmet needs that might be addressed through the JOBS program.

B. Reviewing anticipated service levels as outlined in the Regional JOBS Plan for accuracy and maintenance of effort purposes.

C. Reviewing the full Regional JOBS Plan prior to submission to the Department's Central Office.

D. Reviewing proposals for contracted services.

E. Meeting on at least a quarterly basis to assess JOBS implementation strategies and service delivery models.

(NOTE: This committee will remain active for purposes of providing guidance to the Regional Director and JOBS staff for an indefinite period.)

III. COMMITTEE MAKE-UP

The "core committee" make-up will parallel the Statewide JOBS Advisory Committee to ensure that there is communication between Regional JOBS Advisory Committee members and their Central Office counterparts. The "core committee" will consist of at least one person from the following organizations:

A. Local Private Industry Council

B. Department of Employment

C. Adult Basic Education Learning Centers

D. Area Vocational Educational Institutions

E. Universities and Community Colleges

F. Local Head Start agencies

G. Local Community Action agencies

H. Area Vocational Rehabilitation agencies

I. Tribal Authorities

In addition to the "core committee" members, you should select other local organizations and agencies that have an impact on and/or an interest in serving AFDC recipients. In reviewing the agencies and organizations the Department has dealt with through the WIN, CWEP and the JSAP programs, we believe the following organizations and agencies should be included:

J. Idaho Migrant Council

K. Idaho Legal Aid

L. Alternative School Programs

M. Teen Parenting Programs

N. Idaho Citizens Network

O. Idaho Hunger Action

IV. COORDINATION WITH THE STATEWIDE JOBS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

In order to ensure that there are clear lines of communication between the state and regional committees, the state and regional committees will keep notes and the Regional Director will make sure that those minutes are sent to the state-level committee. Likewise, the state committee minutes will be sent to all members of the regional committee.

Further, the Regional Director, as Chair of the Committee, will be responsible for reporting any requests for information or staff assistance to the Deputy Director, Chair of the State Committee.

APPENDIX C

KENTUCKY

RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE JOBS COUNTY COORDINATOR

KENTUCKY JOBS PROGRAM STAFF

Background:

With the implementation of JOBS, the Department for Social Insurance (DSI) entered into a new era. The transition required actively promoting self-sufficiency, not just providing financial assistance, and affected every aspect of daily activities. The mission became one of selling concepts and setting long-term goals. The agency was to become one of selling concepts and people-oriented and behavior based. Objectives would be pro-active rather than reactive and the clients' long-term independence must become an attainable goal. DSI determined this change in mission required the establishment of two new personnel classifications--a JOBS County Coordinator and a JOBS Case Manager. The County Coordinator has responsibilities, at the local level, for systemic issues. The Case Manager provides services to individual participants.

JOBS County Coordinator:

To help create and maintain a viable network of resources and to address the daily responsibilities of program operation at the local level, the position of JOBS County Coordinator was established. The coordinator must provide a flexible, county--oriented approach to local issues and problems, facilitating solutions among multi-level players.

Generally, each JOBS County has one coordinator. However, counties with very large caseloads may have more than one coordinator and counties with very small caseloads may share one coordinator.

Responsibilities:

- Facilitating role changes in the agency and in recipients.
- Marketing the program.
- Acting as a consultant to management staff and case managers in the day-to-day operations.
- Selecting appropriate AFDC recipients to participate in JOBS.
- Providing for full utilization of local resources; conserving JOBS resources.
- Identifying gaps in services needed and finding means of filling those gaps.

- Resolving conflicts that occur between client/case manager.

- Acting as a liaison between the Department and providers.

- Identifying and resolving client/provider complaints and billing problems.

- Coordinating child care issues with the Department for Social Services.

- Obtaining case managers, provider, and client feedback. Developing corrective measures as needed.

Minimum Requirements for the Position:

Graduate of a college or university with a bachelor's degree supplemented by four years of experience in human services programs. Graduate study will substitute for the required experience up to a maximum of two years. Experience involving interviewing, community services work, administrative work or handling a public assistance caseload will substitute for the required education on a year-for-year basis up to a maximum of two years.

APPENDIX D

OHIO

INTERAGENCY AGREEMENTS

(6/03/91)

A-92-05-127

INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT
BETWEEN
THE OHIO DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES
AND
THE OHIO DEPARTMENT OF ALCOHOL & DRUG ADDICTION SERVICES

I.
PURPOSE

This agreement is entered into by the Ohio Department of Human Services (hereinafter "ODHS") and The Ohio Department of Alcohol & Drug Addiction Services (hereinafter "DADAS") for the purpose of defining the relationship and responsibilities between the parties for ALCOHOL AND DRUG ADDICTION SERVICES, an expansion of services available to ADC JOBS participants. This agreement is entered into in order to implement the provisions of the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training (JOBS) Program, as established by the Family Support Act of 1988 (Public Law 100-485).

DEFINITIONS

ADC (or AFDC) means the Aid to Families with Dependent Children program, as required by Title IV-A of the Social Security Act, which provides aid and services to needy families with children.

JOBS means the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training (JOBS) Program under title IV-A and IV-F of the Social Security Act, as established by the Family Support Act of 1988. The purpose of JOBS is to assure that needy families with children obtain the education, training and employment and support services that will help them avoid long-term welfare dependence.

Pass-Through means "pass through" of federal funds to the provider agency, wherein the provider agency expends non-federal funds in order to render services, and ODHS reimburses the provider agency up to the federal matching rates.

Alcohol and Drug Addiction Services means services, including intervention, for the treatment of alcoholics or persons who abuse drugs of abuse and for the prevention of alcoholism and drug addiction.

II.
RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE OHIO DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

A. Pursuant to federal regulations (45 CFR Part 205, Section 250.10), ODHS is responsible for administration of the JOBS program in the State of Ohio; furthermore, ODHS shall retain final authority for administrative decisions related to the JOBS program.

B. ODHS shall cooperate to plan, implement, monitor, and evaluate the provision of services under this agreement.

C. ODHS shall encourage all County Departments of Human Services (CDHS) to access, when appropriate, the services provided under this agreement.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CDHS and the CDHS are responsible to identify ADC JOBS participants. The CDHS is responsible for appropriate referrals to the services under this agreement.

D. CDHS shall set policy for the JOBS program, pursuant to federal and state law, rules, and regulations.

E. CDHS shall establish fiscal and reporting requirements, and reimburse DADAS based upon appropriate expenditures, as set forth in other sections of this agreement.

III.
RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE OHIO DEPARTMENT OF ALCOHOL & DRUG ADDICTION SERVICES

A. DADAS shall provide Alcohol and Drug Addiction services to ADC JOBS participants.

B. DADAS shall cooperate to plan, implement, monitor, and evaluate the provision of services under this agreement.

C. DADAS, operating through its local entities (317 Boards and local service providers), shall provide Alcohol and Drug Addiction Services to ADC JOBS participants. The local service provider for alcohol and drug addiction services shall provide four services: 1) CDHS staff training, 2) client outreach, 3) client assessment related to substance abuse, and 4) treatment for substance abuse. DADAS shall train CDHS staff in order to facilitate services to ADC JOBS participants, including CDHS staff recognition of substance abuse.

D. DADAS shall encourage its local entities to provide the services where appropriate. Furthermore, to the extent possible, DADAS shall make the services available statewide.

E. DADAS agrees to provide technical assistance, where necessary, to those service deliverers which require such support in developing and implementing the services funded hereunder.

F. DADAS shall adhere to CDHS policy for the JOBS program, pursuant to federal and state law, rules, and regulations. In particular, DADAS shall consider the funding hereunder to be secondary to Medicaid.

G. DADAS shall meet fiscal and reporting requirements, as set forth in other sections of this agreement.

IV.
COMPENSATION

A. REIMBURSEMENTS (As set forth in Appendix A)

1. REIMBURSEMENTS TO DADAS

CDHS agrees to reimburse DADAS, upon proper invoicing and preparation of an Intra-State Transfer Voucher, as follows:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ODHS agrees to reimburse DADAS federal funds net of the ODHS administrative fee (described in section A.2. hereunder) in total amounts not to exceed one million four hundred ten thousand dollars ($1,410,000) during each of the state fiscal years, SFY 1992 and SFY 1993, for the provision of services under this agreement.

The reimbursements are based upon the program expenditures by DADAS, which shall be in total amounts not to exceed three million dollars ($3,000,000) during each of the state fiscal years, SFY 1992 and SFY 1993. Before reimbursement, the program expenditures shall be non-federal dollars.

The federal match shall be in total amounts not to exceed one million five hundred thousand dollars ($1,500,000) during each of the state fiscal years, SFY 1992 and SFY 1993. The amount reimbursed to DADAS is the federal match less the ODHS administrative fee.

In effect, DADAS shall provide the non-federal match of total funds for the project in an amount not to exceed one million five hundred thousand dollars ($1,500,000) during each of the state fiscal years, SFY 1992 and SFY 1993. Non-federal funds previously employed as match for other federal funds cannot be used as match funds for the project identified herein.

Whereas ODHS shall charge an administrative fee, the net cost to DADAS shall be in an amount not to exceed one million five hundred ninety thousand dollars ($1,590,000) during each of the state fiscal years, SFY 1992 and SFY 1993.

DADAS shall submit to ODHS all invoices for reimbursement in a form and according to a schedule as required by ODHS pursuant to state and federal policy. The form includes, but is not limited to, identification of the specific ADC JOBS participant, type of service, units of service, unit cost for service, and dates of service. ODHS shall perform edits of the data in order to ensure compliance with federal and state policy.

2. ODHS ADMINISTRATIVE FEE.

ODHS shall charge DADAS an administrative fee of 3% of the total program expenditures to compensate ODHS for costs of implementing this program. This fee shall be calculated upon the program expenditures as reported by DADAS in requests for reimbursement of program expenditures (described in section A.1. herein), and shall be withheld from the ODHS reimbursements to DADAS. This fee shall be in total amounts not to exceed ninety thousand dollars ($90,000) during each of the state fiscal years, SFY 1992 SFY 1993.

B. Payments for any and all services provided pursuant to this agreement are contingent upon the availability of state and federal funds under the JOBS program. If the Ohio General Assembly, the federal government, or any other source at any time disapproves or ceases to continue funding ODHS for payments due hereunder, this agreement is terminated as of the date funding expires without notice or further obligation of ODHS except that ODHS will subsequent to termination provide written notice in accordance with Article V, paragraph B.2.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

C. All obligations in this agreement are subject to the requirements of Section 126.07 of the Ohio Revised Code.

V.
GENERAL PROVISIONS

A. Effective Dates

This agreement will become effective on July 1, 1991, or upon execution, whichever occurs later, and will remain in effect until June 30, 1993, subject to the cancellation provisions contained in this agreement.

B. Termination by Notice

1. This agreement may be terminated by either party upon 30 days written notice of termination to the other party. Notice of termination shall be sent or otherwise delivered to the following persons: if DADAS is terminating the agreement, to Director, Ohio Department of Human Services, 30 East Broad Street, 32nd Floor, Columbus, Ohio 43266-0423; or, if ODHS intends to terminate the agreement, to Director, Ohio Department of Alcohol & Drug Addiction Services, 280 North High Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215.

2. This agreement may be terminated immediately in the event there is a loss of funding, disapproval by a federal administrative agency, or upon discovery of non-compliance with any federal or state laws, rules or regulations. In the event termination is pursuant to this paragraph B.2., a notice specifying the reasons for termination shall be sent as soon as possible after the termination in accordance with the procedures set forth in Article V., paragraph B.1.

C. Breach and Default

Upon breach or default of any of the provisions, obligations, or duties embodied in this agreement, the parties may exercise any administrative contractual, equitable, or legal remedies available, without limitation. The waiver or any occurrence of breach or default is not waiver of such subsequent occurrences, and the parties retain the right to exercise all remedies mentioned herein.

D. Amendments

This agreement may be modified or amended provided that any such modification or amendment is in writing and is signed by the directors of the agencies. It is agreed, however, that any amendments to laws, rules, or regulations cited herein will result in the correlative modification of this agreement, without the necessity for executing written amendment.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

E. Equal Employment Opportunity

The parties agree that in the performance of this agreement or in the hiring of any employees for the performance of work under this agreement, the parties shall not by reason of race, color, religion, sex, sexual preference, age, handicap, national origin, Vietnam-era veteran's status, or ancestry, discriminate against any citizen of this state in the employment of a person qualified and available to perform the work to which the agreement relates.

F. Confidentiality of Information

The parties agree that they shall not use any information, systems, or records made available to either party for any purpose other than to fulfill the obligations specified herein. The parties agree to be bound by the same standards of confidentiality that apply to the employees of either party and the State of Ohio. The terms of this section shall be included in any subcontracts executed by either party for work under this agreement. DADAS specifically agrees to comply with state and federal confidentiality laws and regulations applicable to the programs under which this agreement is funded.

G. Compliance with Federal and State Laws, Rules and Regulations

DADAS agrees to comply with all federal and state laws, rules, regulations, and auditing standards which are applicable to the performance of this agreement.

H. Partial Invalidity

A judicial or administrative finding, order, or decision that any part of this agreement is illegal or invalid shall not invalidate the remainder of the agreement.

I. Records Retention

All records relating to costs, work performed and supporting documentation for invoices submitted to ODRS by DADAS along with copies of all deliverables submitted to ODRS pursuant to this agreement shall be retained and made available by DADAS for audit by the State of Ohio (including, but not limited to ODRS, the Auditor of State of Ohio, Inspector General or duly authorized law enforcement officials) and agencies of the United States government for a minimum of three years after final payment under this agreement. If an audit is initiated during this time period, DADAS shall retain such records until the audit is concluded and all issues resolved.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

J. Audit Exceptions

1. ODHS shall be responsible for receiving, replying to, and arranging compliance with any audit exception found by any state or federal audit of this Agreement as it pertains to federal or ODHS funding of the Agreement. ODHS shall timely notify DADAS of any adverse findings which allegedly are the fault of DADAS. Upon receipt of notification by ODHS, DADAS shall fully cooperate with ODHS and timely prepare and send to ODHS its written response to the audit exception. Failure of DADAS to timely respond to audit exceptions shall result in liability for any repayment necessitated by the audit exceptions.

2. DADAS shall be solely liable for any audit exceptions, including consequential liabilities thereof, or other liability arising from the performance of this agreement unless it is established that the audit exceptions, consequential liabilities or other liability are due to the acts or omissions of ODHS.

3. If an audit finds that DADAS is responsible for an adverse finding, DADAS shall, unless otherwise instructed by the director of ODHS, pay to ODHS the full amount of any liability against ODHS from the adverse audit finding. DADAS shall be responsible for correcting all audit exceptions to the satisfaction of ODHS and the relevant auditing agency.

4. For the purpose of this section, the term "audit exception", shall include federal disallowances and deferrals.

K. Liability Requirements (other than audit)

Each agency agrees to hold the other agency harmless from liability, suits, losses, judgments, damages or other demands brought as a result of its actions or omissions in performance of this agreement. However, in the event that an agency is subject to liability, suits, losses, judgments, damages or other demands which are due to the acts or omissions of the other agency, the other agency will not be held harmless.

L. Resolution of Disputes

The agencies agree that the directors of the agencies shall resolve any disputes between the agencies concerning responsibilities under or performance of any of the terms of this agreement. In the event the directors cannot agree to an appropriate resolution to the dispute, a designee of the Governor's Office shall make the final determination.

M. Reporting Requirements

DADAS agrees to provide ODHS reports relative to the effective operation of the program. In general, the invoicing (see Compensation, section IV.) shall include data required for reporting. In addition to this

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

reporting, it is understood that ODHS may require the submission of reports, such as progress reports. DADAS agrees to timely submit reports required hereunder.

N. Child Support Enforcement

DADAS agrees to cooperate with ODHS and any Ohio Child Support Enforcement Agency (CSEA) in ensuring employees of DADAS meet child support obligations established under state law. Further, by executing this agreement, DADAS certifies present and future compliance with any court order for the withholding of support which is issued pursuant to sections 3113.21 to 3113.214 of the Ohio Revised Code.

O. Maintenance of Effort

1. DADAS certifies to ODHS that DADAS will not use the Federal JOBS funds to supplant non-Federal funds for services and activities that promote the purposes of the JOBS program.

2. DADAS further certifies to ODHS that DADAS spends each federal fiscal year no less than the total of state and local expenditures incurred in federal fiscal year 1986 for training, employment and education purposes which had a defined purpose of preventing welfare dependency or potential welfare dependency.

3. DADAS further certifies that services to be provided hereunder are not otherwise available from DADAS on a non-reimbursable basis.

P. Local Agreement

The ODHS and appropriate local entity(ies) of DADAS shall enter into a local level agreement in a form as required by ODHS pursuant to state and federal policy. The local agreement shall cover, but is not limited to, the local coordination needed to implement the program here under.

Q. Prior Interagency Agreements

The agencies agree that to the extent they have entered into interagency agreements which conflict with the services, duties or responsibilities hereunder, such interagency agreements are terminated effective upon the date this agreement is executed.

R. Entirety of Agreement

All terms and conditions of this agreement are embodied herein. No other terms and conditions will be considered a part of this agreement unless expressly agreed upon in writing and signed by both parties.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPROVED BY:

TERRY A. WALLACE
Director
Ohio Department of Human Services
30 East Broad Street, 32nd Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43266-0423

DATE: July 5, 1991

LUCILLE FLEMING
Director
Ohio Department Alcohol & Drug
Addiction Services
280 North High Street, 12th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215

DATE: July 2, 1991

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OHIO DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES
FINANCIAL SUMMARY OF INTER-AGENCY AGREEMENT
WITH OHIO DEPARTMENT OF ALCOHOL AND DRUG ADDICTION SERVICES
(PASS THROUGH OF FEDERAL JOBS FUNDS)
AS OF JUNE 21, 1991

Appendix A

OHIO DEPT OF ALCOHOL AND DRUG	SFY 1992	SFY 1993
TOTAL PROGRAM COST	$3,000,000	$3,000,000
REIMBURSEMENTS TO DADAS	$1,410,000	$1,410,000
NET COST	$1,590,000	$1,590,000
TOTAL PROGRAM COST		$2,930,000
Alcohol and Drug Treatment	$2,930,000	$70,000
Administration	$70,000	$3,000,000
Total	$3,000,000	
FEDERAL MATCH **		
Alcohol and Drug Treatment	50% $1,465,000	50% $1,465,000
Administration	50% $35,000	50% $35,000
Total	$1,500,000	$1,500,000
NET STATE COST **		
Alcohol and Drug Treatment	50% $1,465,000	50% $1,465,000
Administration	50% $35,000	50% $35,000
Total	$1,500,000	$1,500,000
USE OF FEDERAL MATCH **		
OCHS Admin Charges	3% $90,000	3% $90,000
Reimbursement to DADAS	$1,410,000	$1,410,000
Total	$1,500,000	$1,500,000

** All percent rates are based upon Total Program Cost.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX E

KENOSHA COUNTY, WISCONSIN

DECLARATION OF COMMITMENT

KENOSHA COUNTY, WISCONSIN:

DECLARATION OF COMMITMENT

1. We are committed to the creation of a reformed public welfare system that fully integrates and consolidates economic support, child support and welfare-to-work programming into a single delivery system. This system forges in the recipient's mind the connection between receiving economic assistance and preparing for work supported self-sufficiency.

2. We are committed to change the complexion and structure of the welfare delivery system so that it can evolve from an entitlement program to an empowerment program that establishes sustained economic self-sufficiency as each recipient's primary goal.

3. We believe that AFDC is intended to provide temporary support to eligible individuals for the purpose of assisting them to reach economic self-sufficiency and independence.

4. We are committed to provide all economic support and welfare-to-work services and activities under unified supervision by co-locating and integrating the services of all participating agencies.

5. We are further committed to involve each participant in shaping his or her own economic independence plan through participation in a progressive series of activities that require the same level of commitment in terms of time and energy as full-time employment. We call this strategy the simulated work week. The intent of the simulated work week is to condition AFDC recipients to the time and situational demands of the workplace by requiring full-time participation in work program activities for a minimum of 32 hours per week.

   We are fully committed to the idea that economic self-sufficiency is not something that can be achieved all at once with the successful acquisition of one well paying job after little or no employment history. We are convinced that it is a gradual process that includes part-time employment, seasonal employment and full-time employment at lower wages before the high-paying job that leads to independence is attainable.

   It is our belief that one of the contributing factors to long-term dependence on public assistance is the change in lifestyle that occurs when an AFDC recipient no longer has to meet the day-to-day demands of the workplace in terms of time away from home and level of commitment needed to stay employed. Long-term

welfare dependence is often characterized by the inability to cope with the multiple demands that the labor market places on the working parent. Our intent is to simulate the demands of the world of work through multiple JOBS Program activities, thereby maintaining world-of-work conditioning for each participant.

6. As part of our commitment to the simulated-work-week strategy, we require participants in the JOBS Program to look for part-time work. We believe that part-time employment significantly adds to the quality of education and training experiences. Part-time work helps clarify occupational objectives, presents positive role models to dependent children, contributes to self-esteem by enabling participants to contribute in a partial way to their own economic subsistence, teaches basic adaptive skills to workplace rules and expectations, adds substance to an employment resume, and maintains parental coping skills. This requirement also mirrors the circumstances of most other non-AFDC students or trainees who find it necessary to earn primary or supplemental income while preparing themselves for economic self-sufficiency.

7. We are committed to promoting and supporting the integrity of the family. JOBS Program policies, participant activities and supportive services therefore operate in ways which support and encourage:

   a. Healthy child development and positive socialization
   b. Healthy parent-child and other intra-familial relationships
   c. Positive and effective parenting styles and behaviors
   d. Positive and healthy home and family environments

8. We are committed to the following assumptions:

   a. The AFDC recipient wants to work and be off welfare.
   b. The AFDC recipient is capable of work and of reaching economic self-sufficiency.
   c. The AFDC recipient is always better off working than completely dependent on public assistance for support.
   d. It is the participant, by personal effort, who becomes economically self-sufficient. The JOBS Program empowers and supports the participant to make the necessary effort.
   e. It serves the best interests of the community for its citizens to participate in the local labor market.

9. We are committed to the following operating principles that apply to both staff and participant relationships:

   a. We have unconditional positive, professional regard for the dignity and potential of each participant and staff member reflected in staff behavior and physical surroundings.
   b. We communicate consciously and non-verbally that we care.

10. We are committed to the principle that the mission of the agency is fulfilled in the personal interaction of interdisciplinary-interagency staff, participants and employers. As the function of staff is to empower participants to attain economic self-sufficiency, the function of management and supervision is to empower staff to be effective in their role.

11. We are committed to entering into a social contract with each participant as the means of ensuring participant ownership of the empowerment process. Under this contract, the JOBS Program is committed to provide an appropriate combination of education, training, employment situations, economic support and supportive services that AFDC parents need to effectively function in the job market, in exchange for a commitment by the participant to participate in JOBS Program activities.

12. We are committed to the strategy of engaging participants in JOBS Program activities as soon as possible and to the greatest degree possible as an established method of shortening stays on welfare.

13. We are committed to placing all JOBS Program participants into a work situation within ten weeks of application that would consist of one of the following (in priority order):

   a. A full-time, unsubsidized job
   b. A part-time, unsubsidized job
   c. An On-the-Job (OJT) position
   d. A Work Supplementation position
   e. A Community Work Experience (CWEP) slot

14. We are committed to evolve the Job Center into a truly community-wide and fully consolidated employment and training resource for Kenosha County. We believe that such a resource will reduce the apparent confusion on the part of employers and applicants alike about available services and programs or where to go for the best response to employment and training needs by reducing the perception of program fragmentation, complexity and inefficiency. Joint marketing of multiple programs to the community will establish the Job Center as the one place where programming can be packaged to meet all employment and training needs for employers and applicants. A single point of entry into the service delivery system will make services more under-

standable and accessible to both job seekers and employers by minimizing the bureaucratic maze. We are committed to high-quality, responsive approaches to developing and maintaining employer and business relationships both in Kenosha County and in nearby labor markets.

15. We are committed to creating a fully accountable delivery system that sets measurable goals, objectives and outcome standards. We are committed to ongoing internal and external monitoring and evaluation of our process, techniques, results and impacts. We are committed to a continual and cyclical process of change with emphasis on improvement in all areas.

16. We are committed to jointly manage the activities of participants as they progress through the various levels of Economic Support and JOBS Program activities through Integrated Service Teams with the objective of enhancing the capacity to plan, organize, control, and process participants through the service delivery system. We are committed to strengthen communication linkages and accountability for participant success by means of an interagency and interdisciplinary approach to case management, joint case staffing, multi-agency sharing of management information system data bases, and multi-agency management planning at both the participant and system levels.

17. We are committed to a decision-making process that is both collegial and consensus building; one that fosters ownership of strategies, tactics and decisions as they affect service delivery agencies.

18. We are committed to be the best we can be and believe that potential is unlimited.

APPENDIX F

STATE AND LOCAL CONTACT LIST

CHALLENGE 1

IOWA

Marvin Weidner
Director, Division of Economic Assistance
Iowa Department of Human Services
Hoover State Office Building
Des Moines, IA 50319
(515) 281-8629

John Bargman
Chief, Bureau of Federal Programs
Iowa Department of Economic Development
200 East Grand Avenue
Des Moines, IA 50309
(515) 242-4777

Renny Dohse
Assistant Chief, Bureau of Field Operations
Iowa Department of Employment Services
1000 East Grand Avenue
Des Moines, IA 50319
(515) 281-8818

NEW HAMPSHIRE

John Fransway
Administrator
Employment Support Services
Office of Economic Services
Division of Human Services
New Hampshire Department of Health
and Human Services
6 Hazen Drive
Concord, NH 03301
(603) 271-4381

Art Ellison
Supervisor, Adult Education
Department of Education
101 Pleasant Street
Concord, NH 03301
(603) 271-2247

Ray Worder
Executive Director
New Hampshire Job Training Coordinating Council
64-B Old Suncook Road
Concord, NH 03301
(603) 228-9500

EL PASO, TEXAS

Luis Nacias
Program Manager
Department of Human Services
P.O. Box 10276
El Paso, TX 79994
(915) 564-6060

Norman Haley
Executive Vice President
Upper Rio Grande Private Industry Council
1155 West Moreland Street, Ste. 235
El Paso, TX 79925
(915) 772-5627

CHALLENGE 2

IDAHO

Scott Cunningham
Chief
Bureau of Family Self-Support
Department of Health and Welfare
450 West State Street, 3rd Floor
Boise, ID 83702
(208) 334-5704

Cheryl Bush
Chief of Planning
Employment and Training Programs
Department of Employment
317 Main Street
Boise, ID 83735-0001
(208) 334-6303

Shirley Spencer
Director of Adult Education
Idaho Department of Education
Len B. Jordon Building
Boise, ID 83720
(208) 334-2187

KENTUCKY

Sharon Perry
Staff Assistant
Cabinet for Human Resources
Department for Social Insurance
275 East Main
Frankfort, KY 40621
(502) 564-3703

Thomas Hale
Director, Adult and Continuing Education
Jefferson County Public Schools
3670 Wheeler Avenue
Louisville, KY 40215
(502) 473-3400

Margaret Whittet
JTPA Liaison
Department for Employment Services
275 East Main
Frankfort, KY 40621

NEW JERSEY

Marion E. Reitz
Director
Department of Human Services
Division of Economic Assistance
CN 716
Trenton, NJ 08625
(609) 588-2000

Robert Guadagnino
Administrator
State of New Jersey
Department of Labor
Employment and Training Services
CN 055
Trenton, NJ 08625-0055
(609) 292-5005

Thomas Henry
Assistant Commissioner for Vocational Education
Division of Vocational Education
New Jersey Department of Education
CN 500
Trenton, NJ 08625-0500
(609) 292-6340

CHALLENGE 3

OHIO

Kathleen Boston
Chief
Bureau of JOBS
The Ohio Department of Human Services
30 E. Broad Street
31st Floor
Columbus, OH 43226-0423
(614) 466-3196

NEW MEXICO

Marise McFaddden
Director
Project Forward
P.O. Box 2348
Pollon Plaza
Santa Fe, NM 87504
(505) 827-7262

Ron Martinez
Director
New Mexico Department of Labor
P.O. Box 4218
Santa Fe, NM 87502
(505) 827-6827

COLORADO

Betty Donovan
DFO\JOBS Administrator
Denver Department of Social Services
2200 West Alameda
Denver, CO 80223
(303) 727-2324

TENNESSEE

Eileen P. Locke
Head Start/PCC Director
City of Chattanooga
Human Services Department
Head Start/Parent-Child Center Program
2302 Ocoee Street
Chattanooga, TN 37406
(615) 493-9750

VERMONT

Edward H. Cafferty
Chief
Reach Up Program
Department of Social Welfare
Income Maintenance Division
103 South Main Street
Waterbury, Vt 05676
(802) 241-2800

CHALLENGE 4

ILLINOIS

Karen Maxson
Administrator
Division of Planning and Community Services
Illinois Department of Public Aid
100 South Grand Avenue, East
Springfield, IL 62762
(217) 785-3300

John Foertsch
Manager
Systems Services Sub-division
Illinois Department of Employment Security
401 South State Street, 3rd Floor North
Chicago, IL 60605

Timothy Harmon
Supervisor
Performance Standards Assessment Unit
Department of Commerce and Community Affairs
620 East Adams Street
Springfield, IL 62701
(217) 785-6048

Marilyn Okon
Chief
Field Operations
Bureau of Employment and Training
Illinois Department of Public Aid
100 South Grand Avenue, East
Springfield, IL 62762
(217) 785-0462

SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

R.W. Reed
Assistant Deputy Director
Investigations, Audits and Information Division
Department of Social Services
7947 Mission Center Court
San Diego, CA 92108
(619) 557-4174

Marge Gilbert
Manager
Contracted Training Programs
San Diego Consortium and Private Industry Council
1551 Fourth Avenue, Suite 600
San Diego, CA 92101
(619) 238-1445

Larry Timmons
Director of Adult Education
Grossmont Adult School
P.O. Box 1043
La Mesa, CA 91944-1043
(619) 579-4770

CHALLENGE 5

MASSACHUSETTS

John Buonomo
Director, JOBS Program
Massachusetts Department of Public Welfare
600 Washington Street
Boston, MA 02111
(617) 348-5930

Pam Barry
Massachusetts Department of Education
1385 Hancock Street
Quincy, MA 02169
(617) 770-7500

Judy Seleznik
Director
Massachusetts SDA Directors Association
20 Wheeler Street
Lynn, MA 01902
(617) 595-0484

PENNSYLVANIA

Ruthann Van Dyke
Director
Division of Program Implementation
Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare
Bureau of Employment and Training
PO Box 2675
Harrisburg, PA 17105
(717) 787-1302

Paul Williard
New Directions Program Administrator
Department of Labor and Industry
Bureau of Employment Services and Training
7th and Forster Streets, Room 1124A
Harrisburg, PA 17121
(717) 783-8050

CHALLENGE 6

KENOSHA COUNTY, WISCONSIN

Mr. Larry Jankowski
JOBS Operations Manager
Kenosha County Jobs Center
Kenosha, WI 53141
(414) 697-2552

SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

Michael Boyles
Analyst III
Department of Social Services
1255 Imperial Avenue, Room 743
San Diego, CA 92101-7439
(619) 338-2781

NEW YORK

Reinaldo Cardona
Director
Bureau of Employment Programs
New York Department of Social Services
40 North Pearl Street
Albany, NY 12243
(518) 473-8744

Iona Mirsky
Associate
New York State Education Department
Bureau of Continuing Education Field Services
Culture Education Center
Room 5D45
Albany, NY 12230
(518) 474-3973

OKLAHOMA

Paul Walker
Programs Supervisor
Family Support Services Division
Oklahoma Department of Human Services
Capitol Complex - Sequoyah Building, 2nd Floor
P.O. Box 25352
Oklahoma City, OK 73125
(405) 521-3932

Jeneane Campbell
Liaison
Oklahoma State University, Technical Branch
Classroom Building 312
1801 East 4th
Okmulgee, OK 74447-3901
(918)756-6211

Cynthia Jones
Job Corps II Counselor
Oklahoma City Job Corps Center
P.O. Box 978
Oklahoma City, OK 73044
(405) 348-6600